JAN 13 1986

I 19 P 3.30: 985/2/v.2

COMPLETED

253

ORIGINAL

MEETING OF THE DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL TO THE PUBLIC PRINTER

HASSE HALL
Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C.

Thursday, October 17, 1985
Volume II

The meeting of the Council was called to order by the Chairman.

Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.
1511 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 808
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
(202) 628-2121

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Jennie B. Cross, Chairman

Diane H. Smith, Chair-elect

Marian Carroll, Secretary

Mildred Mason
Barratt Wilkins
Sandra McAninch (absent)
Susan E. Tulis
James R. Veatch, Jr.
Robert A. Walter
Kathleen Eisenbeis
Clyde W. Hordusky
Rosamond Jacob
Margaret M. Prudden
Hans Raum
Bruce Morton

Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.
1511 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 808
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
(202) 628-2121

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I N D E X

	Page
Welcome and Remarks by Jennie Cross	2
Statement of Ralph E. Kennickell	2
State of Charles McKeown	10
Statement of Roxanne Palmatier	17
Statement of Charles McKeown	35
Statement of Anthony J. Zagami	42
Statement of Bernadine E. Hoduski	52
Satement of Tamara Swora	74
Satement of Carol Becker	104
Statement of Jay Young	120
Statement of Katie Lewin	135
Statement of David Peyton	155
Statement of Toni Bearman	166

Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.
1511 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 808
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
(202) 628-2121

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROCEEDINGS

MS. CROSS: Good morning. I would like to use the gavel again and use it correctly here. It's good to see all of you this morning, and we're especially pleased to have the Public Printer with us.

Ralph E. Kennickell became the twenty-first Public Printer of the U.S. in December of '84. As Public Printer, Mr. Kennickell heads the U. S. Government Printing Office, one of the largest printing and information disseminating organizations in the world. With more than 5,000 employees, GPO is the largest industrial employer in the nation's capital.

Before his appointment as Public Printer, Mr. Kennickell served the Reagan administration in both the Treasury Department and the Small Business Administration. He's a native of Savannah, Georgia. His family has been in the printing business since 1892, and he is very proud of his heritage as a printer.

We welcome you, this morning, back from Europe. Mr. Kennickell.

(Applause.)

STATEMENT OF RALPH E. KENNICKELL

MR. KENNICKELL: Thank you, Jennie. I just got back

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

from Europe. I consider myself the consummate peddler. They were not prepared for a Public Printer going to book fairs and talking to USIA officials and saying things like, "I come to you and I lay 16,000 publications on the table -- let's do business."

(Laughter.)

I had a chance to rub elbows with all the big publishers in the private sector, and I think we scored a lot of points. The only people who were aggravated were the Russians -- thank, God -- and I couldn't think of anybody I'd rather aggravate any more. They wanted one of our brochures on chemical warfare -- I told them they couldn't have it.

(Laughter.)

Thank you, Don.

I'm going to do something today that's rather unusual for me as I'm going to actually read a document -- because it's so important as we gather here in the final hours of the Council meeting. I'd like to read the dedication background prepared for this new Hasse Hall.

In 1895, Congress passed an act establishing the Office of Superintendent of Documents within the Government Printing

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Office. That year, Public Printer Thomas Benedict appointed as Superintendent of Documents, Francis A. Crandall.

That's interesting because I have a special assistant named Crandall, and he swears that this first Superintendent of Documents is a distant relative of his.

Crandall became head of the Public Documents Division and assumed responsibility for the depository library distribution and sales of government publications. He faced the task of organizing and sorting vast numbers of documents, accumulated through the years of GPO, as well as those stored in the House and Senate.

Don, we could all reflect on some of that right now.

Crandall was expected to organize stock for the Depository Library Program and for sales. He was also expected to answer questions directed to his office by the public -- most like what we're doing here today.

The method he decided on was to put together a library as a "stock key" to the documents and to have it serve as a reference source for answering questions. To do this, he turned to a twenty-seven-year-old librarian, Miss Adelaide R. Hasse, who had worked for six years with the Los Angeles Public Library.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There, she organized the documents collected, devised a classification scheme for the documents and compiled a documents checklist. I'm sure we've seen Miss Hasse's fingerprints and tracks throughout all the Superintendent of Documents.

In May of 1895, she came to Washington, D.C., to become GPO's first librarian. Her staff consisted of three catalogers. Within six weeks of her arrival, nearly 300,000 documents, including duplicates, had been organized and classified!

(Laughter.)

Don, is that right?

MR. FOSSEDAL: That's what the information said.

(Laughter.)

MR. KENNICKELL: Did she live here?

(Laughter.)

I wanted to make sure I read that because I didn't want to pull that out of my head, but that's very impressive.

(Laughter.)

Do you think she has any descendants?

(Laughter.)

Without one PC, she did this by the way.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(Laughter.)

For GPO, Ms. Hasse developed what has become known as the Superintendent of Documents Classification System or SuDocs as the librarians call it, which is in use this very day.

In 1897, Adelaide Hasse had put together a document library consisting of 16,841 printed documents and 2,597 maps. Commenting on the library, Superintendent of Documents Francis Crandall said, "In its completeness in preserving every kind of public document, and every edition of the same, it is, I believe, not rivaled by any other collection. . . ."

These documents, I would add, along with others accumulated since 1897, are now with the National Archives document collection. After only two years, in May of 1897, Miss Hasse was pirated away from GPO by the New York Public Library.

(Laughter.)

We always train them good, don't we?

(Laughter.)

She went on to a long career of library service which eventually saw her in Washington, teaching at Catholic University and George Washington University. Today, some ninety years after her coming to GPO, we honor her here -- in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the heart of the Library Programs Service -- by dedicating to her memory Hasse Hall.

This is especially appropriate at a meeting of government document librarians. It is also singularly appropriate as we are about to begin the celebration of Women's Week here at GPO. Miss Hasse's handiwork is still with us, and we are proud of it -- as we are proud of all the GPO librarians who have worked and are working to make GPO a vital part of the library world.

(Applause.)

About time, isn't it? What do you think of the new facility here -- those of you who haven't seen it before. Do you like it?

(Applause.)

We're very proud of it -- very proud of the things that have been accomplished this year. It's taken a long time. The movement to this facility was necessary, recognized after the Library Programs Service had been in, what I affectionately refer to as "exile" down in Alexandria, in a warehouse that had leaky windows and all kinds of other strange things.

We are very pleased that the Library Programs Service is here -- new leadership, top to bottom, things are exciting.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The lighted bin system -- people said that things like that would probably never happen, but they have happened.

It seems like we're also going to be looking at some of the more exotic things with Judy Myers -- the questions that were appropriately raised by Judy Myers. I think that shows that we're moving also along some very, very needed lines.

I'm proud to be able to stand before you today. The comments I made about Europe were easy to make. They were not really prepared for a Public Printer to go to Europe and try to hustle them.

I wanted to sell these people, and I think that now they have a very keen understanding as to what GPO does, what our document distribution facilities are -- and I want you to know that when I started discussing the 1400 libraries that receive daily documents from us, the old world was in awe of that -- very impressed with all of that.

I indicated that one of the biggest differences between our system of government and those of competing systems is that we spend so much time trying to be so very careful to make sure the thought and word of our government are made available to our people. That's what makes us different.

In many ways, you can say that the Library Programs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Service and what SuDocs does in a broad context can be singled out as a single example -- a truly significant difference between our form of government where we're all trying to know everything possible so that we can make our system better and those of competing systems where they just don't have any opportunity for input.

When I was in Berlin -- my first trip to Berlin because when I was in the Army, they wouldn't let me go to Berlin -- I had an opportunity to stand on the western side and look eastward. I'll tell you that is a sobering experience -- a very sobering experience. It's interesting that a wall can divide German families.

East Germans spend a lot of time watching their television sets and learning what we do over here. One of the things -- and I was asking my German counterpart what impresses the East Germans the most; that is, the amount of information that is available to the West Germans is just astounding. The West Germans don't necessarily have all the information that is available to us.

It's easily available to the citizens of this country. That's because of the difference in the way we organize ourselves for information dissemination.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I'm pleased to be here. We're proud of this organization. We're proud of the Council. I understand that we've been dealing with a lot of things in a very forthright manner, as we always try to do here.

I'm proud to be able to acknowledge Miss Hasse after ninety years, and I hope that her descendants -- from the other side of the family since she was a miss -- will have an opportunity to come by and note some of the things that we're doing here.

Thank you once again, and God bless you.

(Applause.)

MS. CROSS: Thank you Mr. Kennickell for making this a very special occasion this morning. I'm very pleased to introduce Mr. Charles McKeown, who is the Director of Marketing who has a presentation for us today.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES McKEOWN

MR. McKEOWN: I do have a presentation, but it's being handled by Mary Lee O'Brien, the marketing librarian. Since we're running a little tight on schedule, I'd like to introduce Mary Lee O'Brien.

Those of you who were here for the workshop met her. In her dynamic fashion, she presented an overview of some of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

things that we're doing, and she'd like to give you a further update on that. Mary Lee.

STATEMENT OF MARY LEE O'BRIEN

MS. O'BRIEN: Good morning. Thank you, Charlie, but you stole my first opening joke. I was going to come here and say I was Charles McKeown, Director of Marketing.

(Laughter.)

My position at GPO is library marketing specialist, and I did give a presentation on Tuesday morning. I was wondering how many people were here for that presentation so I don't repeat myself too much.

(Show of hands.)

Okay, but there are some who haven't; so, please bear with me if I repeat some information. I'll give a brief background of what we are doing and mainly highlight some of the projects that we have planned for the future.

One thing I did want to mention in coming here today and being here yesterday and on Tuesday, I was delighted to have the opportunity to meet so many people who I've spoken with over the phone or who I've been sort of pen pals with throughout the months, sending material to them and the way you're designing promotional campaigns within your own

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

libraries and in your regions and in your states.

I want to emphasize that it's very important what you all are doing -- an extremely valuable part of the campaign. As you all are saying thank you to me for sending the materials, I really just want to say thank you because you are really making this a success.

You are the ones who are going out there and handing the materials to the faculty members, to the local government, to your patrons; and that's the key of this whole campaign.

Did you all receive a copy of "Marketing Update", a two- or three-page flier on what some of the projects we're working on? If not, I think there are some copies there. That gives an outline of some of things we've been doing.

I did want to mention that at the start of the campaign two years ago, we sent out an information kit to 60,000 librarians around the country and all depository librarians -- that is the kit that contained the bookmark and brochure and a list of the libraries about our program and a set of these posters.

We are still sending them out. Anyone who is interested in having extra copies of these materials, please let me know; and I'll be happy to give the materials to you.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We're also doing a television and radio public service campaign. We sent our television and radio public service ads out to about 1,400 t.v. and radio stations a year and a half ago, and they're still being aired. We do have plans to create new public service ads in late '86 or early '87.

I did want to show you the print public service ads and that part of the campaign that's been going on for approximately half a year. The Director of Marketing said he would do the slide show for me -- Charlie. Would someone turn that projector on?

(Laughter.)

We sent out public service announcements to about 17,000 newspaper and magazine editors. They were ads of various sizes and shapes to fit different requirements of newspapers and magazines.

I wanted to show you a few examples of the ads themselves and where they're being printed. Also, I have sets of the public service ads on that table if you'd like to take some home to bring to your own local newspaper editors.

This is one of the ads where we're trying to promote the depository logo -- get that symbol recognizable throughout the general public. Another ad with basic information -- the whole

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

thrust of the campaign is that depository libraries are located all around the country. They have a variety of information, of services available -- to find out more about the program and to find out the depository nearest you, either contact the Government Printing Office or contact your local library.

The library community as a whole has been extremely supportive. There are approximately 100,000 libraries around the country -- only 1,400 which are depositories. We have had a lot of non-depository libraries helping us in our campaign, by alerting their patrons to the depository program and guiding them to the nearest depository library.

Some of the magazines in which we've had our print ads placed for free are Modern Maturity Magazine which, as I mentioned on Tuesday, is the magazine for the American Association of Retired Persons. It is the third largest magazine in the country, following only TV Guide and Reader's Digest.

It has a tremendous readership -- 10.3 million people circulation. If we had paid for that ad, it would have cost over $57,000. Just that one two-thirds page ad -- extremely valuable, plus it's a terrific market because there are a lot of depository materials that are of interest to senior citizens

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

or retired people.

Glamour Magazine took a one-third page ad in its September of '85 issue. That has a readership of 2.2 million people. Great coverage with immediate impact for free. Coverage would have cost us over $16,000 if we had to pay for that ad. We also just found out that the same ad in the same position, one-third of an entire page column, is in the November issue of Glamour, too. That's twice in one year, and we're very pleased with that.

A few other examples are a copy of Newsweek in its northeast regional issue of the magazine. They give us a half-page of an ad. Various newspapers around the country -- certainly, there are many newspapers that are targeted just to their local regions, but there are some that are also national newspapers; and they've been giving us great coverage with the ads.

That's where I think you all can be particularly effective -- you can go to local newspapers and say, "I work at the depository library in this community. I think your readers would be particularly interested. These are the types of materials that we have. If you will please print a public service announcement or just a little editorial comment about

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the depository program and what it provides, I'll be happy to give you the hours of service and when we're open."

It's gives a nice tie-in to the editor, their local readers and the library community. Because it's so local, the editors are usually more likely to pick it up.

This last one is an advertisement in a Piedmont Magazine airline guide, which actually is very valuable because of the tremendous repeat readership in magazines that are in airlines.

They're in the front pocket of the seat in front of you. Pick it up and read it in flight and put it back. The next person sitting there will pick it up and put it back. They're usually in there for a few months anyway. It will get a lot of readership there.

Thank you, Charlie.

That's some of the examples of what we're doing on a national scale here at the Government Printing Office in the marketing program. As I mentioned before, the key to this really is what you, as depository librarians are doing to promote your collections and to make the American public more aware of the program.

What I'd like to do right now is introduce a special

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

guest -- a woman from the New England area who's been involved in a regional marketing program.

I mentioned in one or two columns in "Marketing Your Library" in the Administrative Notes that the NELINET group in New England has devised a regional marketing plan and are testing certain materials, certain exhibits, certain avenues of access to government information to see how the New England population responds to the depository program. This test, if successful, we'd like to utilize their methods and materials in other part of the country.

Right now, I'd like to introduce to you Roxanne Palmatier who's from Northeastern University in Boston. She's going to give you a brief update on what the New England group is doing for regional marketing. Roxanne.

STATEMENT OF ROXANNE PALMATIER

MS. PALMATIER: Thank you very much. I'm usually a documents librarian at this time of morning, not a public speaker; so, please yell if you can't hear me very well.

I'm very glad to be here representing the Government Publications Librarians of New England. Many of you probably know us by our former name which was the NELINET Government Documents Task Group, but we've been active in the New England

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

area for well over ten years now.

I'm standing in today for David Heisser. Probably, many of you know David from GODORT activities and other activities. He's the head of the Government Publications, Microforms and Maps Library at Tufts University. For almost five years now, the marketing project done by our group has been his personal crusade. He's worked very, very hard to get this program onto a solid footing.

I don't have a lot of time to share our project with you today, but for those of you who would like more information, David has an article that is going to be printed in Government Publications Review either later this year or early 1986. This article gives the history of our project, tells you some of the different activities that we've been involved in and so on.

Also, over on the table, some of you may have picked up a newsletter I brought with NELINET letterhead on it. This is the newsletter that was written by David this last spring. What he's done in it is again to review the campaign themes and objectives, and he's covered a few of the projects that we're involved in. For those of you who would like information, those are two potential sources.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In 1980, at what we thought was going to be just a standard business meeting of our government documents group, somebody came up with the bright idea that, perhaps, we should get involved in a publicity program. As it turned out, that was one of those fateful decisions that led us down a long and interesting path.

One thing that has been very helpful to us was that very early we made some decisions about what we'd like to do in this public awareness campaign. I think having these goals to work with has been very useful to us.

First of all, we decided it was very important to define a target audience. We felt that the Government Printing Office is much better equipped than we are to try to do something on a national scale to cover the general public to promote the publications that GPO has for sale and the depository libraries.

We decided to try to present ourselves to professional people who work in non-profit organizations, people who work in small business -- say, firms involved in solar energy or housing or other kinds of public service entities like that. We decided to go for a much smaller segment of the public.

Second of all, we decided not to emphasize government

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

publications in our program. What we wanted to emphasize are the three services that librarians provide and the problem-solving skills that librarians have. We felt that there are plenty of mechanisms for getting information about publications out and what we need to do is to publicize the free information services, the problem-solving skills that we can offer to groups and individuals.

Finally, we decided that we are government documents librarians, not marketing specialists, and we decided early on that it would be very silly for us to try to do a lot of the marketing and PR work ourselves, that we really needed to get some expertise involved with us.

This last decision was one that caused us a number of problems along the way. Our first efforts to get some help in the PR department really feel very flat. We spent a number of years trying to work with student advertising agencies at a local university. While they've done some very innovative programs for other groups; somehow, they just couldn't understand the concept of depository libraries.

We spent a lot of time trying to work with them, giving them more and more chances. Finally, we gave up on this idea and began to work with the Government Printing Office. At that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

point, we started to make some progress. I'll be telling you, in just a moment, about some of things we are doing.

One of the first things we did was try to test our assumption about the target audience of professional people who would be a good one for us to try to go after. David Heisser, through his associations with the Lincoln Institute at Tufts University arranged for a group of us to go to the Top Citizen Participation Institute and also to their Environmental Conference.

We were allowed to put on workshops for the participants, and we drew a surprisingly number of people who really wanted to learn about libraries. I think it's more impressive that we got participants in that we were up against things like coastal zone management and toxic wastes and some really hot topics that people want to know about, but we still had people who chose to come to our library workshops.

What we did in these workshops was to talk to them about government information, about the ways you can use libraries to get government information. We did free computer literature searches in the DIALOG database. We gave them the standard handouts that we all have available in our libraries.

The response to these programs was so enthusiastic. The

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

evaluation forms we got back indicated that people had not been aware of the kinds of services libraries provided and would be interested in hearing more about our programs and what we did. That led us to believe that we were going in the right direction.

Our next step was to conduct a telephone survey. There were a number of us who did this. I, among others, just gritted my teeth everytime I had to pick up the telephone, just expecting inevitable rejection on the other end of the line. Fortunately, many of these non-profit groups that we talked to were very excited that there were library people out there who wanted to communicate with them, find out what their needs were, find out what their interests were and so forth.

From the telephone surveys, which were supplemented by a series of indepth interviews carried out by some graduate students from Simmons, we went ahead and started doing some of the activities that I'm going to tell you about at this point.

I should add that one of the important aspects of talking to all of these non-profit professionals out in the field was that we were able to identify a number of journals and newsletters that were important to these people. This will give us a good idea of where we can place public service

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

announcements, as well as other materials about depository libraries.

At this point, we have three major projects under way. One of them is a Telephone directory project. This one, at the moment, is stuck. New England Telephone is one of the more recalcitrant institutions in New England, and I think that that the Government Printing Office is going to have to come to our aid.

We want to get some listings for libraries in both the blue pages and yellow pages of the phone directory, and, somehow, New England Telephone can't grasp that we're important, that we should be put into yellow pages and blue pages and so on. We're going to go higher to get some support for getting ourselves into the telephone directories. This is something that's underway at the moment.

We're going to start with the Hartford, Boston and Providence phone books, and, then, if those work out well, try to move into other areas of New England.

The second project we're working on, and one that you've heard about, is the portable display unit that GPO has developed for use around the country. If somebody could turn on the slides, I think you had a preview of that a moment ago.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For those of you who may not be able to see the slide clearly, let me just read a description of the display unit. I should mention that the display unit is currently at the new O'Neill Library on the Boston College campus, and my colleagues there report that the students and faculty have been very, very enthusiastic about this unit.

"The module is a lightweight, folding aluminum structure which supports a sign in royal blue with the depository logo and the words, 'Bringing Government Information to You, the U. S. Congress, Federal Depository Library Program, Government Printing Office and this Library'.

"The sign and aluminum structure can be easily packed for cross-country shipment. The ensemble is designed to rest on a table on which handouts and sample documents can be placed. GPO provides a selection of eye-catching government document covers which can be attached to the sign with velcro. GPO also lends a selection of high-interest documents for exhibit on the table.

In addition, the marketing department will contribute a supply "of current brochures and sales catalogs."

I might also add that the folks at Boston College also contacted many of the regional offices of the federal agencies

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that operate out of Boston, and those agencies provided a lot of catalogs and handouts which were added to the things that were sent by the GPO marketing department.

As I mentioned, the people at Boston College are very, very enthusiastic about this unit. One of the things that they suggested that seems to me like a good idea -- they thought that many libraries might like to have something like this display available at tax time.

If your libraries are like ours, we have about five million people coming in around March or April and then on until about August, looking for their tax forms.

(Laughter.)

What we've found is that a certain percentage of these people -- after they've picked up their forms and sort of dumped on the IRS for awhile -- kind of ask, "Well, what's in this room? What else do you do?" Some of us thought that these kinds of units would be very nice to have in your area at tax time.

This is another shot of the display unit.

Our third and final project that's ongoing right now is our PR release project. We have a subcommittee that is working to write small public interest notes that could be inserted in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

journals and newsletters and some of those other sources that we identified from our telephone surveys.

What this committee is doing is trying to collect examples of success stories -- when government documents librarians have solved a tough case for somebody or come up with information that could be used by a group or individual -- and these success stories will then be translated into prose, sent to the GPO marketing department for review and then after that, placed in some appropriate journals and newsletters and so on.

Future things that we hope to do -- we're talking about having members of our group make appearances on some of the Boston area television and radio stations. We're particularly interested in public radio and public television in the area because these are the channels that many of our target audience people indicated that they listen to or watch the most frequently.

One other thing that we're doing with this portable display unit -- our treasury is providing funds to each of the libraries that gets this unit to purchase a copy or two of a high-interest document that they can then raffle off to the individuals at their university. Everybody who stops by the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

table to pick something up can fill out a card; and when the display gets ready to leave, a drawing will be had. Then, the lucky person comes up with a statistical abstract or railroad maps of the United States or a document that the institution selects as being one of interest to its clientele.

That, very quickly, is a look at some of the things that we're doing at the present time. I'd like to just add a few words of thanks. Our collaboration with GPO has been extremely good. None of the things that I've talked about would be as far along as they are without the help of the Government Printing Office.

I'd also like to add a special thanks to Leroy Schwarzkopf whose generous gift of $1,000 to our treasury is funding many of the projects and activities that we can undertake.

I'm going to turn this back to Mary Lee, right now; but I will be around all day. Those of you who'd like more information or if the NELINET handouts have disappeared and would like me to mail one, just catch up with me anytime during the day. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. O'BRIEN: Thank you, Roxanne. Your group is really

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

doing some very important work, and you'll be updated on their projects through Administrative Notes.

Also, I'm happy to report that the Superintendent of Documents has agreed to buy four more portable display units for different areas of the country.

Whenever we get the results of what's happening in the New England project and after we've purchased the other four units, I will put a notice in Administrative Notes saying what libraries are interested in having one of the units in their area of the country.

Then, somehow, we'll devise a list to see which unit goes to what states and, perhaps, we'll get some kind of scheduling developed. This is a test; so, it will take a little bit of planning.

A few more projects I wanted to mention to you, before handing the podium over to Charles McKeown, are some mini-exhibits. These are sort of smaller versions of the portable display exhibit, except that where GPO provides display copies of about twenty or twenty-five popular government publications, little tabletop signs say, "This is a depository library," or "Government information available here -- brochures, fliers and catalogs."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We send this carton of material out to a library and have a little mini depository display within their library for, perhaps, two or three weeks or a month. We're doing this with Palm Springs Public Library in California, right now. It's very successful. It's a very inexpensive, effective way of getting a small display within your library or, perhaps, if you're going to a local meeting.

I'll be telling you a little bit more about that in Administrative Notes, as well. If you're interested in having that kind of display -- just a smaller scale than the big portable unit, here, let me know.

Another project I wanted to mention to you -- we've created public service print ads for the map depository library program, just as we did for the general depository program, the national program. This came about because the Cartographic Users Advisory Council and the Joint Committee on Printing contacted people at the U. S. Geological Survey.

Frank Ousley and Mike McDermott, who's sitting right there -- Mike, would you stand up for a minute, please -- coming from USGS, and asked these gentlemen if they would be interested in doing a special promotional project for map depository libraries.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

They contacted us at the marketing department, and we came up with a set of public service announcements that the map libraries could give to their local newspaper and magazine editors. The editors would take the advertisements and fill in the local map library's name, where it says, "Insert map library here." I know someone's going to print it just as it is.

(Laughter.)

What you're supposed to do is contact your local newspaper and magazine editor and say, "We have a map collection, here. I think your readers would be very interested in it. Would you like to use these ads? Here's the information you can insert in that little area."

I sent them out to about 600 or 700 of the map depository libraries, here, and within two days, I received something back from Robert Walter. He had already taken the ads and created some promotional pieces of his own. It was tremendous.

The marketing update sheets that you have have a sample of Bob's work. He made a bookmark out of one of the ads and a little mini-poster or a flier out of the second one. You can also use the designs as individualized promotional material.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We sent these materials out, and, now, Mike and his group at USGS will be doing a second mailing to the same library group of some other materials that USGS has of use to map librarians. If you want to hear a little bit more about that, perhaps, you could talk with Mike during the break.

A few more things I wanted to mention -- I know we're a little close on the time. In Family Circle magazine, concerning the library depository program -- and there's a sample of that in the marketing update packet as well -- we sent a copy of the print advertisements to Family Circle, along with all the other magazines that we contacted.

They said they did not have a space to put an ad in, there; however, they do have a consumer's guide column. People write in questions, such as "What's the right method of getting fleas out of my dog?" or something like that. An editor from the magazine gives a response.

They called our media specialist, Joyce Truman, and said, "We'd like to do a bit on your depository program." If you see the November issue of Family Circle and in one of the advice columns, someone writes in and says, "I heard about depository libraries. What are they?" Then, you have a little column all about the depository program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(Laughter.)

Great readership -- that's 6.7 million people read Family Circle. I think that's going to be terrific coverage for us.

MR. McDERMOTT: Mary Lee, it's out.

MS. O'BRIEN: It's out, already. Terrific. Great.

A few more things -- I brought some extra lapel pins. They're on the table, and I have a few more in the box. Depository decals -- the small window and door decals, over there -- help yourselves to them.

I did want to mention that we are doing a plan for bumper stickers -- a quick and effective way of getting our message out to the public. I am taking suggestions on messages for the depository library program on bumper stickers. I wanted to read some to you that I don't think we're going to select, but were very interesting anyway.

(Laughter.)

One or two that we had first created, trying to get our message across quickly on a small amount of space, but we received several good comments about these two. One was simply, "Ask me about depository libraries." The other one was, "Follow me to a depository library."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(Laughter.)

A good comment was made by a lot of librarians. In these days and times, we don't want people following us around in our cars. We're not going to use those two.

A few of the suggestions from the library community and from some of the marketing staff which are a little bit too risque for me to put out -- "Have you hugged your depository librarian today?" "Depository librarians do it by the book." And one, only a select group could appreciate -- "Depository librarians do it in lighted bins."

(Laughter.)

A little kinky -- I'm not going to get into that.

One, relating to our microfiche program: "Gone fiching at a depository library." This one I misread it; the actual way it should be read is: "I brake for depository libraries." But it said, "I brake for depository librarians." Thank goodness.

(Laughter.)

Another cute one is: "Deposit yourself at a depository library, your federal information bank." People always confuse our program with that little slot in the banks, anyway, where you put your money.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Warning: This vehicle stops at all federal depository libraries." A little Shakespearean note: "Get thee to a depository."

(Laughter.)

And finally, "Do you know where your depository libraries are?"

(Laughter.)

Those are really enjoyable suggestions. I'm still taking any ideas you all might have up until the end of October. Then, we're going to tally up the more popular ones and let you know through Administrative Notes which ones have been selected and when they'll be available to you.

I also wanted to mention one more item. The whole purpose of the campaign is that we get the American public to know about the depository program and to get them into your libraries.

Aside from the people reading the ads in magazines and newspapers and hearing the ads on tv and radio, we also have them contacting us directly here at the Government Printing Office. A lot of them, I hope, are going to you or to the local libraries and then being directed to you.

I receive approximately six or seven letters a day

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

saying, "I saw your ad in the paper or on TV. Can you tell me about the depository program?" I send them a cover letter describing the program and a listing of the depositories in their area and a bookmark and brochure. Then, I'm sending these people on to you.

I just have to read one final letter I received very coincidentally yesterday. It says, "Dear Sir". I get a lot of "Dear Sirs". So concise and so perfect -- "I would like to do a lot of things with the federal depository library. Your friend, Charles DeBrock".

We all would like to do a lot of things with the depository library. We are getting response, and I think the program is working very well. It certainly has a lot to do with all the effort you're putting into it. I thank you for your assistance in that. If I can be of any service to you, I'll be around later on in the morning.

Are we running a little short on time?

MS. CROSS: No, I think you're all right.

MS. O'BRIEN: Okay, I did want to ask Charles McKeown to give us a brief update on what marketing is doing with the sales program and library involvement.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES McKEOWN

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MR. McKEOWN: Thank you, Mary Lee. Thank you, Roxanne. That was a very fine presentation.

I want to apologize for Mary Lee's somewhat subdued presentation today. We've been working her very hard, and she's usually much more lively and outgoing and thorough, but she's really under quite a strain. So much for my humor.

Jennie, thank you very much for having me here. I understand that I was finished five minutes ago. I'll do it quickly. Mary Lee does handle the depository marketing program quite well, as I'm sure you're beginning to become aware. It doesn't really leave a lot more for me to tell you.

I do want to tell you about a few projects that are on the sales side of our operation that have an effect on the depository library side. One, is our work progress with Books in Print, the "Bowker Catalog" of virtually everything in print that's currently available.

You're going to be seeing GPO publications listed in Books in Print in fair quantities for the first time. Approximately 180 titles have been submitted, and we expect to increase that very shortly to at least 250. We hope that it continues because it is a very, very good source, a reference source, for not only librarians but also other people who

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

acquire books.

We're also working to increase the number of government titles that are sold through book dealers and jobbers. This is an area in which librarians can help us. Their help can come in the form of their requesting through their jobbers and book dealers government titles.

In other words, we can create, perhaps, a pooling effect of demand through those jobbers and book dealers, even though we're not able to offer quite as an attractive discount policy to those dealers. We hope that, perhaps, some day in the future, we can correct, or improve, rather, the discount policy and enhance that operation even more.

We are also trying to enhance our communication with the book dealer community. We're working in the very early planning stages on a newsletter aimed at that audience to have them become more familiar with our operation and acquiring government titles.

We're also investigating, doing some inhouse research on ways that we might improve the ordering procedures that we have in place right now within the GPO, within SuDocs, for making it easier and more palatable for these book dealers to deal with us.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Another program that I'd like to mention is the -- or not a program, exactly, but a phenomenon -- the depository library government book store cooperation that we're beginning to note. I have here a letter from Mary Kercz at Boston Public, and it's a very nice report on a display that they held. "Vacation with Documents" was the theme, and it was held at Boston Public Library.

She indicates that the publications "ran the gamut", as she puts it, from the National Forest Service, the National Park Service, handbooks on foreign languages, CIA, street maps, travel information from the State Department, posters from Fish and Wildlife and so on.

The public response to the exhibit was very positive, and quite a number of people inquired about where these books might be available. They were referred to the Boston Book Store, and we have noted an increase in traffic and inquiries at the Boston Store.

This kind of cooperation is something that we certainly applaud and encourage, and I thank Mary Kercz for her kind letter.

Another area is what I'm calling very informally, a "Depository Library Sign Project". This is something that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

popped into my head during a recent visit to a depository collection in which I noted, being a visually-oriented person myself, that, perhaps, some identification of the collection would be beneficial.

I was wondering if I could see a show of hands of people who think that something like this -- I'm thinking on the order of a cardboard-type sign, perhaps, with the depository logo and an indication, such as "Federal Depository Library Program" in small type and large type, maybe with the government information -- something like this.

In other words, something to keynote and highlight the collection and tie it in graphically with this logo that we're promoting nationwide which you've seen by all these examples. Does that sound like something that would be well received in your libraries? Could I see a show of hands?

(A show of hands.)

Better than half -- I like that. Thank you. We'll pursue that possibility.

Also, something that we're doing is we've mentioned maps. We're working to enhance our promotion of our map sales, and, in fact, we'll be meeting in connection with the International Map Dealers Association next month -- a workshop

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

being sponsored by NOAA, the National Oceanographic Service, U. S. Geological Survey and the Defense Mapping Agency and GPO.

I guess in the last moment that I have here I want to mention that we also have an aggressive schedule of exhibits next year which, briefly, I'll mention some of the spots it will be in because you may find yourself there and you can look us up.

We've already done the International Association of Chiefs of Police just this week in Houston, and we know from the Public Printer's remarks that we've done the Frankfurt International Book Fair. Currently, in fact, he cut a ribbon just a few minutes ago at the Gutenberg Exposition here in Washington.

The National League of Cities in Seattle in December, the Public Library Association in April, the League of Women Voters of the U. S. in April in Washington, the Printfest in May in Washington, the American Booksellers Association and the National Education Association are some of the ones that we have already on our schedule.

As a result of the favorable experience with the portable display unit that we developed for the depository program, we have gotten permission from Mr. Fossedal to take

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that same concept into the sales program and acquire at least one unit for that program and test it as we did with the depository program.

That wraps it up. I know we're a little over time. I want to thank all of you for allowing me to have a few minutes here, and I would very much like to hear any comments that anyone has on things that marketing can do to make more of the American people aware of depository libraries and the great resource that they are. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. CROSS: Thank you very much. What you're doing is very exciting, and I think you'll see results. About every magazine that I pick up seems to have something in it about the depository program, and I'm very excited when I pick it up and see it and I just think it's great.

After the dedication of Hasse Hall, there were some sheets about Adelaide Hasse, and they will be at the table. At the break, if you would like to get one and read a little bit about her history, it will be available for you.

I'm very pleased that we can have our Joint Committee on Printing update. We always look forward to what Tony Zagami and Bernadine Hoduski have to tell us. First, may I introduce

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Tony Zagami who is the General Counsel at JCP.

STATEMENT OF ANTHONY J. ZAGAMI

MR. ZAGAMI: Thank you, Jennie. I listened with great interest to the remarks of Charlie and Mary Lee, and I might mention that I commented to Bernadine when you were speaking. I just kind of whispered. I said, "I wonder if there aren't some librarians out there saying to Mary Lee: Do you have to be so damn successful? We're not going to have any room in the library if this keeps up --

(Laughter.)

MS. O'BRIEN: I've heard them say that.

MR. ZAGAMI: -- the reading room and the counterspace. In any event, I'd like to congratulate both of you on the job you're doing. It seems to be working out very well for the GPO and the depository program. In spite of the fact that you stole fifteen minutes from us this morning, congratulations.

(Laughter.)

We do have forty-five. I think my comments from the last meeting seem to have stuck with Dan or whoever was preparing the agenda.

In any event, on behalf of our chairman, Senator Mathias of the State of Maryland, our vice chairman, Mr.Annunzio, the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

members of the Joint Committee on Printing and the staff, as well, I would like to welcome everyone to Washington. For those of you who are Washingtonians, welcome to GPO.

Incidentally, I'm not sure if all of you know this. Senator Mathias who is currently the chairman of our committee, Charles Mathias of Maryland, has announced that he will not seek reelection in 1986. He will finish out this term, both as a Senator from Maryland and Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, but he will not be returning to the committee for the 100th Congress which begins January 1 of '87.

What do I have to say to you today? There's no further progress on the regulations, or I guess the guidelines and policies as we now call them, but I do want to say that there has been some -- can everyone hear me okay? There has been some significant progress toward implementing some fairly key provisions contained in the regulations.

A circular was sent out -- which I put some on the table in case any of you are interested in picking up a copy. A circular was sent out on September 23rd to all department heads. This circular requested the submission of comprehensive printing and distribution plans to be submitted to the JCP not later than the date on which the agency's submit their new

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

budget requests.

I'm going to read to you a couple of the provisions or a couple of the points that are contained in the submission because I think they'd be of great interest to everyone here. Among other things -- now, they do request a lot of information concerning production methods and printing equipment and things of that nature.

I want to hit a couple of these provisions that I think are very important to you folks and I think will have some meaning to the depository program, as well as the sales program.

One of the things we're looking for in this plan is the number and types of government publications to be published and the anticipated distribution methods to be used. Next, we're asking for the number and titles of all government publications for which the department intends to seek a private sector publisher; for example, journals and things of that nature.

The number of articles which the department intends to publish in privately published journals or compilations, including the names of the journals and compilations, the number of articles to be published in each and the total dollar amount per page charges to be paid -- that's going to be a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

tough one for them to comply with, but I think in time they will be able to adapt themselves to that.

A description of all government publication user fee programs and, finally, the procedures used to notify the Superintendent of Documents of intent to publish and the procedures used to provide all required copies of government publications through the Superintendent of Documents -- of course, that would be depository library copies in the event they publish outside of GPO.

We're also working at the present time on a redefinition of printing. This is something that was a cornerstone of the regulation revisions; and, hopefully, if we can come up with some reasonable definition that will satisfy our needs, the definition would encompass all the new technologies which are now a part of this information chain.

Once we complete that, we hope to send out another circular to the departments on that particular matter.

It's probably going to take a while for the agencies to adjust to these new requirements for this so-called plan. I hope that all of you pick up a copy of it because it is rather interesting and it really is a very important part of the revisions that we're attempting to do some point in the past.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Eventually, we think that the requirement for reporting, along with the redefinition of printing, will force the federal government as a whole to review your printing distribution programs -- perhaps, with an eye towards planning and managing them in a proper fashion, which I think in many cases it's not done today.

It should also facilitate the job that the Joint Committee on Printing and also the job that the GPO, the Superintendent of Documents, because so much of what we have to do, our time is spent keeping track of what's out there. We normally have to go out and find out, rather than have it come into us from the agencies.

Hopefully, if we can convince the departments and the agencies to give us this type of information, we can spend a lot more time looking at the big picture, if you will, as opposed to chasing a publication all over town and trying to get it into the system because some agency doesn't have the money or they don't want to spend the money or something like that.

At last spring's meeting, I spoke to you briefly about the Chadha decision which is the Supreme Court decision dealing with legislative veto and also its effect, of course, on the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

depository library program. I referred to an article that I had written to the Government Information Quarterly, and it was published earlier this year.

For those of you who have not read it, there are some copies over there on the desk on the side. I won't go into any repetition on what I said at the last meeting, except I would like to say that I have gotten some additional support for my conclusions and my theories in that article.

The United States Code Annotated which many of you know is a Westlaw publication, privately published. For the first time -- and I know Peyton you're aware of this -- for the first time, the pocket supplement contains annotations with regard to Title 44. They actually deleted certain portions of Title 44, sections in chapter 5, and substituted a reference to the Chadha decision and legislative veto language contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act.

This is a first, as far as we're concerned, because the official code did not make any reference to that. I believe, in my own personal opinion, I think the researchers at Westlaw were, maybe, a little too vigorous in their approach in this particular area.

In any event, it was interesting to note that all of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sections in chapter 19 and also the sections dealing with the Superintendent of Documents for sales and other programs, international exchange of publications -- these were all left alone. There's nothing in there at all. They were free of any deletion or substitution of language.

Even though I was uncomfortable reading what they had done to chapter 5, I was delighted to see that in their research and in their wisdom, they did not find any problems in the sections with distribution, either through the depository library system, sales, whatever.

Finally, a brief word about the insurance issue. I think Jennie asked me this morning about the insurance issue which we discussed in great detail. I shouldn't say "we"; really, I think most of the work was done by GPO counsel at the last meeting.

I told you at that time -- for those of you who were at the last meeting -- that I believed the issue warranted some further research. I also told you that I would consult with GPO counsel, general counsel and the counsel who researched the matter for the spring meeting upon our return to Washington.

Unfortunately, there have been some departures from GPO, and the general counsel is no longer the general counsel. He

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

has left to take another position. The attorney who did such a fine job researching the issue and the attorney who reported to you last spring has also left.

The current acting counsel has more than enough to keep him busy at the moment. I didn't want to encumber him with this additional request. For the time being, I want to tell you that we're going to have to postpone this matter, at least for a short period of time. Hopefully, at the spring meeting, we'll have some additional -- I agree with you Peyton. It's one I never should have -- we never should have brought it up, but now that we have, we have to deal with it.

In the meantime, just keep an eye on your rare books, and everybody say a little prayer that hurricane Gloria doesn't come back to visit anytime soon. It's not scheduled -- actually, it won't be called Gloria, they'd have to change the name; so, whatever.

One other thing along those lines. I don't know if Don Fossedal mentioned it in his discussions, but I have had some discussions with Mr. Fossedal about the possibility of hiring an insurance consultant that could be hired by the Superintendent of Documents for the purpose of coming in and establishing -- at least, establishing a plan and some

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

guidelines on how someone would, in fact, evaluate a depository collection. He is now exploring that idea to see if it can be done and what the cost would be.

If that were done, I think it would be very helpful to give that information to the depository libraries so that they could, at least, evaluate the collection to see what it is worth, what it would cost to replace it if they had to.

I think that's about all I'm going to say today. I think Bernadine wants to talk to you about cleaning up the tapes -- among other things, that's one of the topics. I know that one is near and dear to everyone's heart. She has some other interesting things to say.

In light of the fact that we're running a little late. Let me ask you -- will we get our full forty-five minutes?

MS. CROSS: We'll try.

MR. ZAGAMI: We do want to have time for questions and answers, comments, whatever -- that's always an important part of this program, I think. We do enjoy hearing from you, as well as answering questions. I'll ask you to hold up on those until Bernadine's completed her comments.

The only other thing I'm going to tell you is that Tom Kleis, the JCP staff director, is going to be over here today

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

at one o'clock to be on a panel to discuss the OMB circular on management of federal information.

I know a lot of you have expressed some interest in that. You have asked questions about it at the spring meeting. I'm just going to encourage you to attend that and to hold your questions concerning -- at least, questions you would send to Bernadine and myself -- to hold those until this afternoon, and I think we'll have time sometime during that panel discussion to comment or ask questions of Tom, as well as some other people who will be representing other positions on that circular.

Thank you very much.

MS. CROSS: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. CROSS: Since Mr. Kennickell was here first this morning, he gave us just a little bit of a cushion. I thought that, if necessary, we would shorten our coffee break a little bit in order to accommodate everyone because I think it is important to hear what they have to say.

I just need to know -- is Tamara Swora from the Library of Congress in the audience? All right.

Now, Bernadine Hoduski who is a professional staff

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

member for the library distribution services for the Joint Committee on Printing will speak to us. Bernadine.

STATEMENT OF BERNADINE A. HODUSKI

MS. HODUSKI: I would like to devote most of the time talking about the guidelines that GPO staff and I have been working on. I'll just cover a couple of other things to start off with.

As far as Tony was talking about the three-year plan that the agencies have been asked to present which, hopefully, will include the problems of getting documents, non-GPO documents, in particular, into the depository library program because, hopefully, that will focus the attention of the heads of the agencies so that they will assign someone who is really responsible for that overall.

In working with GPO and trying to get the non-GPO documents, they are using our liaison list, the people that we deal with, which sort of on the surface would seem to be difficult and time-consuming because we have a liaison with the Department of Transportation and that person reports back to us on all the subagencies.

Unless you have someone who is accountable, who you can go to, that both of us can go to and say, "You're responsible

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for getting things into a program and you're not doing it, and we hold you to blame for it," you're not going to get the results that we need.

It's sort of a painful process, but I think this circular from the Joint Committee on Printing members will certainly help us.

The section on the journals -- reporting journal articles, those articles that government employees write. We've already given about six waivers to agencies to have their employees' articles published and to pay page charges and to purchase separates, rather than reprints.

A separate is something that is printed at the same time as the journal, and a reprint is something that is printed after the journal is printed. It's a fine distinction when you're talking about paying people in money. It's actually cheaper for the agencies to buy the separates at the same time to save press run, than to go back and reprint and have to have it in the contract to reprint.

They used to reprint those things through GPO. We've given them a waiver because it makes much more sense financially for the government. In return, they have to tell us how much money they are spending. This has been one of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

great mysteries -- how much money.

These six agencies that we're working with have been very cooperative. We just recently given a waiver to NOAA, and they will be working with us to get the stuff in the depository library program. We're still working on how that will be done. We've also been working on specific agency problems. I get letters from you all or carbons of letters you send to the Superintendent of Documents or I get phone calls.

Cornelius Dunn, as most of you know, as always finds a good document that he wants in the program, and he let me know about the 500 major defense contractors. I did go and talk to the Department of Defense people, and they weren't even really aware that it wasn't in the program, and our liaison to all of DOD intervened and got that available to you.

The Tax Court memos -- that problem has been straightened out. You'll be getting that on microfiche. That took us a while to negotiate who was going to pay for what part of that program.

The Merit Systems Protection Board -- we've sent over to them from GPO an estimate of what it would cost them to put their decisions on microfiche.

We're meeting with the EEOC people Friday afternoon as

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

we had given them a waiver, but so far they have not complied with the waiver requirements provided in the depository copy. We're meeting with them to try to find out what went wrong and how we can rectify that situation.

One of the other big projects we're working on is a long-range study of the Government Printing Office. The Joint Committee on Printing has asked the Office of Technology Assessment, General Accounting Office and GPO to jointly do a long-range study of needs for new technology, needs of customers and so on in the future.

It's going to be a three-stage program. GPO is in the stage now of gathering information. GAO will be working with them to survey customers to find out what their needs are for the future. OTA will look at the work of both those agencies and tell us what kinds of technologies should be used or other considerations in order to implement the needs for the next ten years.

This is going to be a real exciting study. Don is responsible for feeding the information into the study, as far as SuDoc goes. I'm really pleased that he has initiated this little study group -- we're still debating what's it going to be called -- where we meet every Monday and talk about what

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

should happen in the future.

I'm sure that a lot of you who signed petitions, write resolutions, get people to endorse them, write letters -- wonder what happens to all of these things and do we pay any attention to them. I can assure you that we do pay attention to them.

I personally, if an organization like ALA with 40,000 members passes a resolution, you'd better believe that members of Congress do pay attention to it. They may not move as quickly as you like on it or they may not understand what you're talking about, but they do pay attention to it.

Maybe it's just because I'm a librarian and I like political organizations, but I do know the difference between various library organizations. If I get something on legal materials from law librarians, I certainly would appreciate that, realizing they have special expertise in that area.

We like to hear from all the groups, and we will be talking in this group about the various recommendations that you've made and whether we, as a group, can see a way of implementing them or improving the system. I think it's a very positive thing. It's a really nice group of people to meet with. Thank you, Don, for that -- a nice couple of hours every

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

week.

Also, I talk about this everytime I come to Council, everytime I go to GODORT, everytime I go to the law library, everytime I go to SLA, everytime I go anywhere -- I think there are symptoms of a painful situation. I'm going to an acupuncturist now so I'm learning all about "don't treat the symptom, treat the source of the problem".

I think that's what we have here. We come to the meetings with problems -- wrong class number, whatever it is -- but there are underlying problems that need to be addressed. I think the underlying problem is not that the GPO staff do not want to do a good job. I know all of them, and they all try to do a very good job, and they're very dedicated to what they're doing.

It's not that they're incompetent or that we're incompetent as librarians -- it's a matter of that they have to have proper support. They have identified this in the studies they've done, and I think the underlying support they need is more automation and more systems planning, so that the work they do is not wasted.

I know that Sarah Kadec and Jay Young and Jim Livsey have all done work to identify needs for automation. The

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Council and GODORT and others have identified needs for automation. I think this is something that should get a priority, that we should get the support for the people here.

We've all seen the operations and we know that people are doing the best job they can with the resources that they have, but they need some additional resources.

The other thing is that if they get the inhouse automation system, a Monthly Catalog that they're able to track the publications that come in, the requisitions, you only key the class number in once into a system; therefore, you don't have three or four people dealing with it or oftentimes as many as twenty or thirty as Sarah said in her study.

You can also do other exciting things like take the DOE tapes and put it into a computer and do a few modifications to it and have the MARC records.

It's not a matter of adding twenty-one additional staffers to do 20,000 titles a year. It's a matter of having a system inhouse where they can accept cataloging tapes from the Department of Energy and the Defense Department, both agencies of which have insured the Joint Committee on Printing that they are willing to provide these tapes and to change them into a MARC format.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I really have sort of made a promise to myself -- I'm not going to leave the Joint Committee on Printing until we have cooperative cataloging where we get the big ticket items in, as Carl Labarre used to call them.

The next thing is in the area of electronic access. Again, you all are very impatient, just as I am, but after ten years of working for Congress, one has to learn to be patient and not expect everything to happen overnight, particularly when you're getting into a big program that's going to affect a lot of libraries and a lot people.

We have done a lot of work on preparing for the future, which is really with us right now. We sent out our provision of electronic information to the depository libraries and reported to our advisory committee last December, I believe, that every depository library received a copy.

We've also sent out an additional thousand copies to members of Congress and the private sector and other interested organizations, offices and groups. We had an open forum on the 26th of June. We just have a copy of the report, hot off the press. GPO very graciously speeded this up for me, so I could have it for today -- it saves a little postage, also, since we can give it to the Council members.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. Fossedal assured me that everyone in the depository libraries will get a copy of it, so I'm not going to be handing out copies to you all. I'll send most of yours to the depositories. If you're not a depository, let me know before you leave the meeting; and I will send you a copy if you're not a depository library.

There's some very interesting proposals in here, a lot of librarians from librarians. We have no lack of volunteers to participate in pilot projects. Those of you who have not written, volunteering, rest assured that we are just not going to go with the people who got themselves together and wrote a letter.

When we develop the pilot projects, we will be asking the library community as to who is interested in participating; and we will try to have a fair way of deciding. It may depend upon the geographical area or subject area or something like that that makes senses for a pilot project.

The ad hoc committee will hopefully be meeting in November or December. I have to contact them as to a good time to meet. They have to have a chance to review the transcript and the proposals, to work more on evaluating the suggestions, more specific criteria, and to look at some of the ideas that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

come in for pilot projects.

If you have any input on this or want to express your interest in being a pilot project library, go ahead and send a letter in. There are several libraries that have been very effective in getting every one of their state's delegation to call or write a letter to our chairman.

I'm getting to talk to a lot of nice congressional staff people who never heard about depository libraries, let alone trying to access for them. They're all eager to learn more about it, so it's given me a chance to talk to more people and educate them about what's going on.

We have the General Accounting Office doing an audit of the Depository Library Program, and they made a number of suggestions. The one suggestion in there that we followed up on and very blessedly the Office of Management and Budget read the GAO report -- at least, they took us up on the idea of guidelines. We've also talked with the federal publishers committee, and they're eager to receive guidelines.

Actually, we had started JCP and GPO on looking at guidelines almost two years ago where we were looking at the kinds of publications the agencies were sending and those kinds they weren't sending.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Some of the agencies took the approach that everything came off the printing press, including the wet paint signs, would come over to GPO and then Barbara and her staff would have to sit down and wade through all of this and decide what was appropriate and what wasn't appropriate. By the time they decided, it was a problem getting additional copies.

We would like to have the agency printers and publishers know enough about what is needed for this program, so that when they get a requisition inhouse, and usually doing it inhouse has a certain amount of urgency involved with it, that they will know how many copies to go ahead and print.

Hopefully, there will be some stabilization in the item numbers and all that, so that we're not telling these poor printers and publishers every week or so or couple of months that the number has changed. We need to have some stability because we're dealing with an awful lot of people.

I hope that all of you picked up a copy of "Provision of Government publications to depository guidlines" somehow or another our secretary left off "draft" on top of this because there are typos in here. We had a holiday on Monday, and she typed this on Tuesday.

Barbara and Mark Scully and I spent three mornings last week looking at a whole tableful of publications and attempting

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to describe them or put them in categories, and they had examples. Of course, we expected you to criticize us on this -- give us ideas of additional titles or additional categories.

I want you to keep in mind these guidelines are not complete; they're just the beginning of our brainstorming sessions. For example, in the guidelines, there is not a section on procedures. We still have to provide that. The agencies will want to know who to send this to and how to send it and this kind of thing.

There are other things in here. We also did not write a section on cooperative publications or privately published publications, as yet, because we need some more advice on how to write that section and we need to get some good examples. We will be going through our file at JCP as to all the agencies that we've given waivers to and give some examples of that.

I would like to just briefly go through these guidelines and get some comments. The Council has had a chance, hopefully -- we were all staying up to midnight last night looking at it and critiquing it for you.

MS. CROSS: Thank you, Bernadine. Council, do you have questions of Bernadine or Tony? Comments?

(No response.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MS. HODUSKI: While you're looking at it and thinking about it, I'll tell you how this is structured. What we did was take federal information circulars -- OMB did -- and use the same format, except change it for guidelines, and go through and give the purpose of the guidelines, the authority on which the guidelines are being issued because this is basically like a regulation based on a law and where it applies to the background as to why the guidelines are being published and, then, definitions.

One of the definitions that we debated on -- or two of the definitions -- were public interest and educational value. When I went back and looked at the legislation and hearings, I really did not find any definitions of either one of these.

People make the assumption that these are easily understood terms. When you come down to actually dealing with printer and publisher, they don't know exactly what you mean by public interest and educational value.

You could go through the broadest definition, which is under the FOIA, to a very narrow definition, which some agencies have done -- unless they specifically intended this for public distribution, then, it's not applicable or something that's considered strictly administrative.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

They may think it is in the agency -- for example, the IRS manuals. I've had a number of people come up to me and tell me that a number of these are not available to the public. They may be available to CPA's or to others, but not to the general public. Those people who do their own taxes don't get the same information as those who are paid to do taxes for others, and they don't understand why they're not getting this.

These are kinds of debates that actually the depository library community and the public has to have with the issuing agencies. There's a big educational problem. If GPO is told this can't go into the program, then I think it's the responsibility of the library community to go to the agencies and say, "Wait a minute, the public wants these, and these are the kind the public wants," and so on.

This has been very effective with certain agencies -- the Defense Mapping Agency. The Geological Survey has always given us almost everything we want anyway, so we never had a problem with them.

A number of other agencies -- the CIA for one, who before '76 didn't provide anything -- these agency people are amenable if you come to them with the right arguments and treat them like they're human beings. In a lot of cases, they will

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

give it to you. They just didn't realize that you wanted it, or they weren't encouraged to give it to you because they like to deal with human beings.

We also divided with appendices into publications that should be in the program, Appendix 1, and Appendix 2, those should not be in the program. The final one which we just begun work on are things that are special formats, like a consolidated reprint or a wheel that has information on it -- things that they might not think of as publications are available to the program.

MS. JACOB: I just wanted to say that the more we know -- this business about the IRS -- we have been trying to get those manuals from them sort of locally, and it doesn't make a dent. If you can tell us via Administrative Notes or something what agencies you're trying to work on, we'll help you work on them.

I think that's part of it because I had no idea anybody was trying to get them, but me. They're mentioned in their publications. It actually tells the public to look in some of those things, and, yet, you can't get them out of them at all.

I think this is terrific, and I love to see things like news releases. We mostly just have to get on mailing

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

lists outside of the depository program. I think it's just great.

MS. CROSS: Thank you. Marion. Marion Carroll.

MS. CARROLL: My question is, here in the guidelines in 5B, it mentions "published". I assume that this document refers only to paper materials. Right?

MS. HODUSKI: I've never considered the term publishing to just mean paper -- I mean we're doing microforms. You've recently gotten records; you've gotten photographs; you've gotten all kinds of things. The Joint Committee on Printing definitely does not consider the term "publishing" just to be paper because the GPO right now is selling electronic tapes and so on.

MS. CARROLL: Would it be useful, then, perhaps, to add a definition of "published", "publishing", "published material"?

MS. HODUSKI: Well, I'm not sure if it would be or not. What would be your definition?

MS. CARROLL: I thought, perhaps, that many people might interpret this as meaning only paper. That was my concern.

MS. HODUSKI: Nowhere in the circular does it say that this just refers to paper.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MS. CARROLL: Very good. Thank you.

MS. HODUSKI: We leave that up to the agencies. They can interpret it and deal with us on that.

MR. MORTON: Bernadine, that may be well and good, but in the past GPO's own Counsel has interpreted published to mean paper only. It seems to me that if you're trying to communicate, you ought to make it very clear to the agencies just exactly what you mean; or we'll be going through this same discussion three years hence.

I would suggest that phrasing if, in fact, you mean machine-readable, relative machine-readable data, etc. -- which I guess from the ad hoc committee that you have been involved in recently, I would presume that you do -- that the term "government publication" means informational matter which is created at government expense or as required by law would be more appropriate in conveying what you really mean.

MS. HODUSKI: Informational matter created could include a lot of different things. It could include personnel files and other kinds of things which are protected by the Privacy Act. "Created" is a very broad term. We're using here the definition that's in 1901, which I think, personally, has a lot of flexibility; but there are different opinions as far as

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

legal counsel goes.

Of course, the Joint Committee is going to do these pilot projects on electronic information. We didn't feel, and our staff director, when I talked with him about this, did not want this written in a way that would restrict it to paper, but he did not want to specifically put in "electronic" at this point. He wanted to leave it broad enough so the agencies could have some flexibility in that there are some agencies that will be participating in electronic pilot projects.

We did not want to get into a big discussion about the definition of publications. We'd like to, at least, get something out that will get you the things in paper and microform and records and other kinds of things that are more or less traditional publishing media at the beginning.

It's better than what we have now, which is no directions at all to the agencies, except for the law.

MR. ZAGAMI: Just to answer Bruce's question -- we don't put a great deal of emphasis on publishing, in terms of the method or the means. You can publish in different formats -- paper, microfiche, whatever.

I think our emphasis, with regard to publishing goes on the dissemination of the product. It's more or less the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

fact that you do reproduce and disseminate to one or more audiences.

I think that's where our emphasis goes with regard to publishing and the definition of publishing. In that definition, we don't put a great deal of weight on the method or the means of publishing.

That does give us that flexibility; so that, as Bernadine said, you can -- when you refer to publishing -- you can refer to publishing in paper, publishing electronically or in microfiche or whatever.

MS. SMITH: This is just a point of clarification. On Appendix 1, where you have other items or examples of things that should be included, Number 20 includes scientific and technical reports and studies. Does that include contract reports, as well? I assume --

MS. HODUSKI: Yes.

MS. SMITH: Does NTIS know that you're doing this?

MS. HODUSKI: It doesn't matter whether NTIS knows about it or cares about it. It's not their responsibility; it's the agencies'. The agencies provide things to NTIS and provide them to GPO. NTIS can continue to do whatever they like. They've never been responsible for the Depository Library

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Program.

Just one other quick thing -- we, as many of you are aware -- Congress is cutting everyone's budget, including its own publishing program. The congressional printing and binding appropriations, the proposal -- I'm not sure if it's going to pass -- is to cut back nine million dollars from the congressional printing and binding, which is printing for Congress.

Naturally, the Joint Committee on Printing is trying to give a good example on less expensive publishing without eliminating the product. We're coming out with a new format for the depository library's "Committee Print". We have reduced the size of it from about 140 pages down to to about 40 pages.

What we've done is taken the size format that you see up there on the board when SuDoc took our "Committee Print", stripped it up and put it into a larger size, so that we've gotten more libraries onto a page. We use a different size print, which we think is still readable

We also combined the second section, which was Congressional districts, with the front matter, so at the end of each state, what you have is a listing if there are any

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

vacancies in that state -- say, senatorial or representative vacancies in the congressional district.

I expect there to be some discussion and controversy about this new format. I just wanted to alert you that it's probably going to be printed. I just got some proofs yesterday afternoon -- some preliminary proofs on it, and it will be coming out in a couple of weeks.

When you see this new-sized publication and the different format, don't be surprised. If you have any comments -- good or bad -- let us know about it.

One of the benefits to it is that we cut the price of the rider rate which was seven hundred and some dollars per thousand down to $317 per thousand. The Consumer Information Center last year gave away 30,003 free copies of this "Committee Print" that went out to citizens.

Now they'll be able to afford, with the Superintendent of Document's support, to give away that many copies at half the price and maybe give away more copies. One of the benefits is that we'll get more copies out to more people. We hope that you'll like the new format when you see it.

Thank you.

MS. CROSS: Thank you, Bernadine. Does the Council have

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

any further comments or questions at this time?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: What I'm going to do is make a slight adjustment in the agenda. Dr. Patricia Reeling will not be here today. We will have a brief report from GPO on the Education Task Force. She couldn't be with us because there was a serious accident that her mother was involved in; so, the needs of her family at this time had to take precedence. We are sorry that she can't be with us, but there will be a brief report.

What I want to do is take a break now and reconvene at 10:30. We will begin with Mrs. Swora from the Library of Congress on the optical disk publishing. Carol Becker, who is from the Department of State, will be making a presentation. Jay Young from GPO will make a presentation about the on-demand service, and, then, we will hear about the Education Task Force.

If you would, please, have a brief break, let's begin promptly at 10:30.

(Coffee break.)

MS. CROSS: At this time, we're going to have the presentation on the Optical Disk Program at the Library of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Congress. As I mentioned yesterday, there will be a tour on Friday afternoon at 1:30 at the Library of Congress, Madison Building, to tour the Optical Disk System at the Library of Congress.

Please go to the main entrance of the Madison Building and right to the gift shop. There are some who asked about a place to check luggage. You may check your bags while you're on the tour if you want to then go from the Library of Congress to the airport or to wherever you're headed -- that is possible if you're interested. Please be there at 1:30. The tour will last an hour. I think we'll be very interested in what they're doing.

Tamara Swora who is the Print Pilot Operations Manager for the Optical Disk Program at the Library of Congress has kindly consented to come and give us some information on the optical disk system and what they are doing at the Library of Congress. I'm very pleased to present Ms. Swora.

STATEMENT OF TAMARA SWORA

MS. SWORA: What I'm going to do is talk in general about the entire Optical Disk Program at the Library, and it's a highly ambitious project. I'm sure you'll get a sense of that as I proceed through the talk.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For those of your who will be touring through the program tomorrow at the Library, you'll be seeing much of what I will be speaking about. For those of you who will not have that opportunity, I think you'll get a sense of what we're doing from what I'll be saying.

If we could have the lights, we'll see how these slides work and give you an idea of what we are doing.

I'm very pleased to be able to talk to your this morning about the Library's Optical Disk Pilot Program because an important continuing responsibility for project staff has been to inform the greater library community of our past and current activities.

What I'm going to do is, first, give you some background about the technology and the program, indicate what progress we have made -- first, in the analog or the video disk non-print project; then, focus on the digital system or the print project; then, end by touching on some of the over-arching issues of preservation and copyright which are very important concerns of ours.

Some of the information which I'll relate to you is included in the brochure, which if you haven't received, you will receive.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The primary goal of the Optical Disk Pilot Program at the Library of Congress is to evaluate the use of optical disk technology for information preservation and management to determine if such a system can be put to wider use in the future at the Library of Congress and at other libraries and archives.

Our experience to date has demonstrated that both digital and analog technologies will serve our preservation needs, and more efficient machine-controlled access to our material will be provided, thereby enabling us to meet the continuing challenges of preservation and access.

Basically, there are two types of optical disks: analog disks -- this is a disk that we have produced within the project in the Prints and Photographs Division -- and digital.

The two types of disks look similar . They're both round, typically twelve inches in diameter. They both show color defraction patterns, but they're really quite different in their application.

Analog video disks are used primarily for entertainment and instruction, and the information is recorded continuously in patterns. Digital disks are used primarily for mass storage of binary, discrete and uniform bit information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Analog disks are produced by filming onto 16mm or 35mm film, then transferring the information to one-inch videotape and then creating the master videodisk and stamping out multiple copies.

Digital disks are produced by draw or direct read-after-write technology and can be written only once but read many times or "worms" as these disks are termed. In other words, analog disks are all pressed from he same master, and digital disks are rewritten everytime a new copy of a disk is made.

Digital disks are currently not erasable. Optical digital disks are produced by high-density optical recording of digital information at the wavelength of light. Analog uses low-resolution CRT's or standard television monitors, which can provide a possible resolution of only 525 lines per screen.

A digital system requires high resolution CRT"s in order to display material which has been scanned at a resolution of anywhere from 200 to 480 lines per inch.

Since both digital and analog storage technologies are highly compact, and space is such an acute problem at the Library, both technologies will enable us to store information economically at extremely high densities. Some 15,000 pages

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

can be stored on one side of an optical digital disk, 54,000 stillframes or motion picture images can be stored on one side of a laser videodisk. Sixty minutes of sound can be accommodated on one compact audio disk.

Now, that I've talked a bit about the technology, I'd like to give you some background about the program and an overview and update.

The program all began with the establishment in 1982 of an Optical Disk Technical Committee by Bill Welch, Deputy Librarian of Congress, to develop requests for proposals for an analog system to capture image-based or non-print and sound material and a digital system for print or text-based material.

These contracts were let late in 1982 -- one to the SONY Corporation, making use of current, off-the-shelf technology in the analog or videodisk system and the other with Integrated Automation of Alameda, California, to develop the hardware and associated software for a digital system. After these contracts were let, a three-year management plan was designed for both the print and the non-print areas of the program.

We began by identifying staff from all over the Library who had the talents and skills necessary to administer the program, and these were the skills we thought were needed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

After having identified the appropriate staff and in order to meet the goals of the program, the Library decided to employ an experimental staff structure -- what has been termed "matrix management".

Because the program requirements and goals involved many divisions and crossed departmental lines, it seemed appropriate to leave the traditional hierarchical management structure and, instead, identify some project goals and functions, so that the program could use the variety of talents and skills enumerated on the previous slide, irrespective of the normal lines of command.

I might add that this has worked very well in what has become an increasingly more complex program.

The whole program was then divided into smaller projects with teams working together to solve problems, accomplish tasks and to think ahead -- whenever there is time -- to future issues when we begin to implement this formally within the Library structure.

Throughout 1983, these matrix teams designed procedures for testing the actual operation of both the analog and the digital systems, assembled material and monitored both contracts.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There are eleven projects included in the program, and they are all guided by a Director of Projects who is Joseph Price, the Chief of the Science and Technology Division of the Library. He reports directly to Bill Welch, the Deputy Librarian.

I currently head one of these projects, the Print Pilot Operations Project which is Project IV.

Now, I want to describe in some detail the non-print or image-based and sound project. The project has created eight disks to date -- five laser disks and two compact audio disks. As was mentioned, these disks have been developed primarily for the entertainment industry.

These disks are all read by lasers and, predictably, have a long life without degrading. Three of the disks will contain still images, two of these include collections from the Prints and Photographs Division and one offers movie stills from the Motion Picture Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division.

As I mentioned, they were photographed on 35mm color motion picture film prior to their transfer to videotape and then to videodisk. They're filming a poster collection here which is one of the more colorful and interesting collections

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

on that videodisk.

The original film copy, the original camera negative, can then be used at some time in the future to produce a new disk when a high-definition television signal has been standardized in the United States.

The Prints and Photographs disks include some very lovely images: Turn-of-the-century scenes of the Americas from the Detroit Publishing Company -- this is Havana represented here; color transparencies of the late 1930's and early 1940's from the Farm Security Administration; plans and drawings from the Architectural Collections, including this projected design for a Library of Congress building; American cartoons and posters; drawings, glass negatives and transparencies and, also, other photographs.

These disks contain original material, much of it unique to the Library and all previously unpublished and unavailable outside the Library. The still-image disks will have a major impact on research because they offer such large collections for browsing on videodisk.

The disk from the motion picture collection offers over 90,000 publicity stills from the '40's through the '60's. Three other disks will include motion images. Film and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

television productions and the two audio disks will present music from concerts in Library Coolidge Auditorium.

The design of retrieval approaches for these disks has been challenging and much-facilitated by the interactive capability of the videodisk. The Prints and Photographs disks will have several levels of access, so that user reaction can be tested.

Currently, a database of captions to the images on the Prints and Photographs disks is being created by catalogers within the Division. They're relatively complete descriptions of the items; and although they are not full cataloging, the captions will be formatted in such a way to facilitate upgrading in the future to MARC records using the recently approved visual materials format.

Once a researcher identifies the material they need, an instant print camera is available to make reference copies by photographing the image on the screen or a print hardcopy can be made on an attached printer. You can see it's on the far right -- very small, but useful nevertheless.

Although these disks provide efficient access to an enormous amount of material, certain sacrifices are made. For example, users lose a sense of the size and feel of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

material much like we lose the feel of books or book-type material when it is transferred to film or optical disk. The image is less than ideal because of the limitations of American television monitors currently.

Nonetheless, it seems evident that the combination of the modern technologies of videodisk and computer far outweigh these disadvantages and will have an enormous impact on the management and preservation of picture and other special non-print collections.

Now, I want to move onto the digital system. We deal with these projects quite separately. I will talk about the hardware, the software, some document preparation and input scanning techniques and the retrieval for electronic document delivery.

Since this is a more complex system which is entirely computer driven, all of the areas will require a great deal of explanation, so please bear with me.

During the course of the Pilot Program, 1983 through 1986, we expect to scan between 500,000 and 1,000,000 pages of text in black and white and halftones only, largely for economy of storage, because color storage quickly consumes disk space, as is demonstrated from this slide -- where, predictably, on

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

one side of a 12-inch, 1-gigabyte disk, scanning at a resolution of 300 x 300 lines per inch, which is what we are doing, we can expect to store anywhere between ten to fifteen thousand pure text images on one side of a disk.

When they include halftones, that drops down to 500 to 1,000; and for full-color image, we will only be able to accommodate 110 images. You can see that there's a dramatic difference. This largely has to do with the amount of bit storage required to regenerate both the halftone and the color images.

The print or digital project is divided into two phases. During phase one, what we're calling production-type scanning, we're scanning previously machine-indexed documents and articles from the Congressional Research Service SCORPIO SDI File which, as you may know, was developed primarily for congressional use.

Using this file was an extremely prudent move on our part because much of the preparation has already been handled, and we were able to focus our energies on system hardware and software development, rather than on preparing material and developing an entirely new machine indexing system.

Our work with the file will also provide valuable

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

results for the Congressional Research Service, as their staff considers using optical disk technology to replace a largely micrographic-based document delivery service.

In phase two of the project, we'll prepare and scan popular periodicals and journals -- this is for the print disk, now -- Government publications, technical reports, legal materials, manuscripts, music and maps, thereby demonstrating that the full text of documents which are housed in the original throughout the Library's three buildings can be searched, delivered and printed at the same terminal.

I now want to give you a bit of a technical overview and describe the hardware and software that we have. What we have is very much a modular system, in which components can be added or changed as the technology advances; and we have done that on numerous occasions already.

As you can see, the system hardware includes: one page scanner, one microfiche scanner, a video system controller for magnetic disk drives, a stand-alone optical disk or drawer unit, a jukebox with an optical disk drive, terminal cluster controller, eight image or display terminals, one batch printer and two convenience printers. It is really a very complete system.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The two scanners that we are currently using include a page scanner, which is capable of scanning material anywhere from 5 x 7 to 11 x 14, all at a resolution of 300 x 300 lines per inch. The 11 x 14 pages or sheets are immediately compressed to 8-1/2 x 10 for display.

Currently, one average scan with some illustrations -- because, although we call this the print- or text-based project, we do have a few illustrations now and then -- an average scan will then produce about 8,000,000 bits of data, which at a compression ratio of 10 to 1, nets about 800,000 bits per page. We are storing those numbers of bits. If it's pure text, it can go as low as 120,000 bits per page.

We also have a microfiche scanner which accommodates only 24x standard 98-frame microfiche. The fiche are scanned frame by frame, using the same scanning techniques and compression which we're using in the paper scanning.

The ATG or the Alcatel Thompson Gigadisk Disk Drive provides the capability to read directly after writing onto the optical disk which it contains. The jukebox or the storage module stores up to a hundred optical disks mounted in two carousels of fifty disks each.

We're currently using a pre-production level prototype

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

jukebox, but several weeks ago we began scanning onto our first production level disks and have since received an upgraded jukebox which will accommodate the new production level glass disks -- our pre-production disks were plastic disks -- and we are now in the process of installing it.

Instead of having the only jukebox of its type in existence, now, there are others around, and it's going to be far more easy to maintain that particular piece of equipment.

We have six user-display terminals and are using the remaining terminals for scanning and quality review. The display terminal resolution is 150 x 300 lines per inch although we scan, store and print at 300 x 300.

The batch or remote printer is a modified XEROX 5700 Laser Printer and it's interfaced directly with the jukebox. It prints at 300 x 300 lines per inch, as do the modified XEROX 2700 convenience printers which are attached to two of the user terminals. Copies can be made on demand from the display at these terminals.

The systems software which is very critical in a digital system -- the software for input and retrieval was designed and programmed by the staff of the Automated Systems Office at the Library. Software associated directly with the hardware, such

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

as in the scanners and the other equipment, is being provided by the vendcr, Integrated Automation.

The input process in the digital system involves acquiring and assembling material, fully reviewing and collating it, scanning, quality review, rescanning as needed and transfer to the optical disk for subsequent retrieval.

The operations staff for the Print Pilot Program, those who actually perform all preparation and input tasks as only a part of their duties are the staff of the Library's Preservation Microfilming Office, which is where I am from. All of our complex workflow tracking and staff scheduling is handled by a full-time operations coordinator.

We found that many of the procedures and techniques that we have long used for microfilming seem to be appropriate in the preparation of documents for scanning. In fact, we've incorporated portions of our microfilming manual into the working draft of our optical disk procedures manual.

During preparation, each document is collated page by page, and a form we have termed the "input header sheet" is completed. Thereafter, the material is sent for scanning. The input header sheet serves to fully describe the characteristics of the original document and is used to log the document

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

through each processing stage from preparation through quality review.

In the preparation and input process, we develop records or make use of existing machine records, collate the document, complete the input header sheet and, finally, send the document for scanning. Material is then sent to the optical disk by stepping through the input subsystem software.

If the room is pitch black, I assure you you can see this slide, but we're at definite disadvantage here. At any rate, that's simply the screen on the Data General which depicts one of the menus that we use in the input process.

The page scanner that we have can be fed automatically or manually. During the pilot project when we scan some of the more difficult material, containing light pages, we experiment with different scan settings, often using a combination of the light, medium, dark and halftone settings in the scanner control panel which you can see in the slide.

After the material is scanned, it resides on a magnetic buffer, and we must begin reviewing documents and transferring or writing them to disks to free space in the buffer for further scanning. The images are reviewed for fidelity to the originally scanned pages which have also been retained with the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

input header sheets.

So, we're doing 100% quality review during the course of the pilot program, in order to determine really to what degree we need to fully review this material prior to committing it to an optical disk.

After review, the images are written to the optical disk in the disk drive which is in the video system controller. You can see that the gentleman is tinkering with it there. There is another disk drive adjacent to the controller.

After a disk is filled, we take it out of the disk drive and it's placed into the jukebox which is the storage module, the retrieval mechanism. This is a really lovely photograph that someone came in -- it's backlit, and it figures prominently in our center. You'll see it tomorrow.

Once the filled, completed disks are loaded into the jukebox, all subsequent transactions -- this simply summarizes what I said earlier -- and after we have loaded the material into the jukebox, the transactions are handled by the IBM mainframe at the Library which sends messages via the controller to the jukebox to retrieve documents or images. As such, this is not a stand-alone system since we are running everything through our mainframe.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We have four public-image display terminals in reading rooms in the three Library of Congress buildings. They are located in the Science and Technology Reading Room, the General Reading Room; Serials and Government Publications Reading Room, and the Congressional Reference Division.

The optical disk system is searched using standard SCORPIO commands which most of our users are familiar with, and you may be also. After they've identified a document which they feel they need to review, they request the document and the jukebox fetches the needed disk. A request can also be made to print off-line or, again, on the attached convenience printer.

The jukebox operates much like an old-fashioned player for phonographs. When a selection is made at one of the terminals, the jukebox spins the carousels until it locates the required disk. The mechanical arm reaches for the disk, removes it from its slot and places it on the turntable where the data can be read to a magnetic disk buffer.

This mechanical activity can take a number of minutes in order to display the requested material on the screen. As you know, minutes can seem very long to on-line users. Therefore,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

when images are being retrieved, we're displaying a "gone-to-the-stacks message", so that the process itself is explained. We hope that this will engage the user until they receive their first image and they're impressed with the complexity of what's occurring.

That is really an important factor because a lot of this is technically explicable but somewhat magical.

After this process is completed, the first page comes up, and that's taken from a display screen. Then, the researcher can step through the document or order prints or whatever is necessary.

Since you are now aware of the full-range of what we're doing in both projects, I want indicate where we are now. In June, 1984, the analog system was first made available to the public with the installation of a player and monitor in the Prints and Photographs Division. In December, 1984, a similar user-work station was installed in the Motion Picture Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division.

Throughout 1984, the hand-built prototype digital system, which I have just described, was shipped to the Library, installed and thereafter intensively tested. All equipment and software from Integrated Automation were

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

conditionally accepted in November, 1984.

Not until January, 1985, did we begin production-type scanning, database building and retrieval testing, which we will continue throughout 1985 and into 1986. We're currently scanning onto optical disks and routinely loading them into the jukebox for retrieval.

In February, 1985, our high-resolution, image-display terminals were installed in the four public reading rooms. We've had several types of tests since that time. One, by the LC Public Reference Staff and, then, the Operations Staff have recently over a two-month period done some stress testing of the systems, so that we could determine how the jukebox would perform under what would be really extreme conditions.

As I mentioned, we've received production level glass disks, and this is a true milestone. We were hoping to have our new jukebox available with our entire new database.

I want to focus on two important issues in the program -- copyright and preservation. Both issues are of great importance in the evolution of the use of optical disk technologies in libraries and also in publishing. Since the Library is the home of the Copyright Office, we have a special duty to respect the rights of copyright holders.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Much of what we will be scanning into the digital system or transferring onto videodisks is subject to copyright restrictions. Our Pilot Program, which is in large part a research and development effort and an experiment in technology has also required a corollary extensive investigation of intellectual property rights.

We could have made the decision to exclude items that are under copyright protection, but, instead, decided that we needed to test the long-term application of optical disk technologies.

In order for us to work closely with publishers, an Optical Disk Advisory Committee was formed in 1983 by Bill Welch. The Committee includes both proprietors, publishers and users-librarians, and it has met several times during the past two years.

During these meetings and in formal correspondence, we have described the system to publishers and have asked for permission to use their journals, to display them and print them without royalty payments for the duration of the Pilot Program.

We have received permission to include 73 periodicals from 1983 through 1986 in the program, and they include such

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

popular periodicals as Time, Newsweek, Fortune and the like.

The majority of publishers we have contacted are supportive of the program and very eager to participate, but they're concerned that we not go into the business of publishing on demand and that we be sensitive to their concerns about copyright royalty fees.

Another important issue that we face at the Library, and in libraries generally, is the preservation of the materials we hold. Optical disk technology does have the potential for a revolutionary transformation of preservation work.

While the industry projects that optical digital disks will last between ten and twenty years, which in most circles is considered to be non-archival, we do not feel that this diminishes the usefulness of the technology for preservation purposes.

We view optical disks as viable preservation media because the quality of the data on digital disks can be monitored electronically through error detection and correction codes contained within the disk.

If errors are detected, the data can be written onto a new disk. Therefore, when we consider optical disks as a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

potential preservation medium, we are concentrating on preservation of the information or data represented on the disk, and the long-term stability of the disk itself is of secondary concern.

In the non-print or analog system, it's not expected that the images stored on disks will be a replacement for the original, and you can see why from this slide. Videodisks are recorded with the normal U. S. Broadcasting Television signal which offers a good television image, but which cannot faithfully reproduce detail.

Instead, videodisks will serve as service copies for a large percentage of the researcher's needs and will eliminate much unnecessary handling during retrieval and use. To illustrate this point, I'll quote a recent researcher who reported that in 2-1/2 days, he was able to view about 10,000 negatives, while in 1977 he spent 2-1/2 weeks looking at 500 prints.

As you can see, for the past 2-1/2 years we've been very busy with this experimental program, and the progress which we've made has often placed us at the cutting edge of technology. This has been extremely exciting to us.

We've also approached the experiment very ambitiously in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the hopes that our effort and experience will directly benefit LC and be useful to other libraries, irrespective of size and character of collections. All information which we gather will be shared, just as we have provided details concerning the program.

I thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. SWORA: Do we have some time for questions?

MS. CROSS: Yes.

MS. SWORA: Good.

MS. CROSS: First, I want to ask if Council has any questions or comments. Bob.

MR. WALTER: I've got one. This is a purely technical question. When you do make your optical disk and place it in the jukebox, do you make up a backup copy and put it off someplace in case there's some kind of mechanical failure or if something happens to that one in the jukebox, that's it -- you have to go back and do it all over again. What's your procedure?

MS. SWORA: We're not making a backup copy at this point, largely because it's a pilot project, and we don't feel as if we have to cover our tracks -- yet. We're not making a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

backup copy because it's a pilot and also because, frankly, there are not many 12-inch optical disks available. We now have 26 disks, six of those are glass production disks and the others are plastic disks.

We're hoping to rewrite from the plastic to the glass to have a full glass database. I feel that's possibly what we will do although we feel pretty secure about that data once it's on the disk, but the disk is a physical item, and it is quite possible that breakage or something might occur, even though it's unlikely given the way they're handled.

MR. WALTER: I take it to this date, at least, you haven't had any mechanical problems that would have damaged any of the disks you've prepared.

MS. SWORA: No, not really dramatic ones. We really haven't.

(Laughter.)

We're not dropping them -- particularly the glass ones. The plastic are fairly durable, too. You really have to see the jukebox where the glass disks -- it's different.

MS. CROSS: Your system is strictly for users coming to the Library of Congress. You're not planning to market these or distribute them in any way? They will be simply internal

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for the Library of Congress?

MS. SWORA: During the course of the pilot, we have opted not to consider distribution of the disks in any way. That's largely because we're still working with the publishers, and, as I mentioned, we don't want to compete with their efforts at this point.

The most marketable disks certainly are the prints and photographs and the motion picture disks. The digital disk is really a one of a kind, and if the information is to be transferred, it would be transferred electronically -- probably, rather than copies made of those disks.

When a copy if made, the entire disk has to be rewritten. You have to run it from one disk drive to another, and every bit of information has to be transferred, and the videodisks can be stamped out.

I'm sure you're familiar with the disks at the Air and Space Museum at the Smithsonian. We would probably mount a similar effort because the collections that we have, as I mentioned, are unique. We feel that it would benefit everyone if we were able to distribute them, but we won't in the near future.

MS. CROSS: Further comments?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MS. BALDWIN: Yes, I'm Julia Baldwin from the University of Toledo. I'm still a little unclear about the digital disks. Are they service disks, also? What's happening to the paper copy after it's put on the digital disk?

MS. SWORA: We are retaining all of the material that we scan during the course of the Pilot. What we want to determine is the stability of that data on the disk; so we can, ultimately, in the future, discard material in favor of what is on an optical disk. Our preservation testing project is a very important one.

During the Pilot, no, we don't plan to discard, but Time Magazine and Fortune Magazine and those kinds of materials -- there's really not a question there since we have so many copies. We do plan to scan manuscripts and music, and those collections are quite rare. We plan to be very careful because we're very happy that they allowed us to include them in the Pilot.

MR. MORTON: Has there been any deliberation between your legal staff and the publishers about the copyright implications under the "Fair Use Clause" of the Copyright Act in the electronic transfer of data -- say, under the rubrics of interlibrary loan or whatever, where you're not actually

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

republishing for storage but merely transferring an electronic format?

MS. SWORA: We've had many discussions, certainly, and the Copyright Office is well aware of the fact that this is a problem which is certainly not going to go away because it was not handled in the last revision of the copyright law -- although I'm certainly not the copyright expert for our project.

I think it would be safe to say that we feel that ultimately some revision of the law will be required for us to adequately deal with all the ramifications of electronic publishing.

MS. CROSS: One of my concerns in the optical disk publishing area is the lack of uniformity. Is the Library of Congress in your committee or council that you mentioned or in the office of automation doing anything to try to get uniformity in the industry?

MS. SWORA: Yes, one of the projects that we have is the Standards Project. It, in fact, is headed by a Director from our Automated Systems Office, Bill Nugent. He has been very active in the new standards groups which are dealing, primarily at the moment, with error detection and correction coding for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5-1/4 disks, establishing standards for the small disks, and, then, they will undoubtedly work their way to the 12 inch. It's probably due to the fact that the 12-inch are deemed to be less marketable than the 5-1/4, and standards for the 5-1/4 have to be attacked immediately. We certainly see that it's critical. Absolutely.

MS. CROSS: Thank you very much, Tamara. We appreciate your coming. All right. One more.

MS. ISACCO: Jeannie Isacco, OCLC. I just had a question about the 5-1/4 disks. Did they have any place in your Pilot Project and if they didn't, was that a conscious decision or was that because the technology is too new.

MS. SWORA: It has to do primarily with the storage capacity because these are pure digital disks. We're not doing any kind of conversion. We have an enormous amount of bit storage per disk -- 800,000 bits per image is quite a bit. It has to do with their capacity.

Also, we experimenting with a compact audio, so that there's some component of working with the range of optical laser disks which were available at the time when we started the program.

You have to remember that we started this in '82. In

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

'82, there was very little in the marketplace. I think, in true response to your question, the 12-inch we feel is going to be the archival disk.

MR. WILKINS: Are you doing anything to archive also the equipment to read these things -- say, the early disk will probably be outmoded in twenty years. Are you doing things to archive the equipment to read in twenty years to thirty years?

MS. SWORA: No, I'm afraid we're going to have a jukebox to offer someone within a few weeks. What we are doing is -- it's very wise in order to keep pace with the technology to use the newest disks and equipment available, of which we're all aware of in other technologies. What we are doing, at the moment, as we speak, rewriting from the plastic disks that we had onto the glass disks.

We had a prototype jukebox with, in effect, prototype disks which we are now rewriting entirely onto the glass disks to be housed in the new jukebox. That is really the kind of progression that will probably have to take place until the market stabilizes, until we get some standards, until, for example, it's fully incorporated into the Library. I must stress this is still a pilot program.

Also, we have one of the few operating systems anywhere

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for optical digital disks.

MS. CROSS: I think this is a very fascinating subject and something that I think will affect all of us in some form or fashion in the near future. I wish that we could continue on for another hour or two, but we do have some other things. Are you going to be able to be here until lunch and if somebody needs to see you, then, before you go back to your office, that they could?

MS. SWORA: Of course.

MS. CROSS: Thank you, again, very much for coming.

(Applause.)

MS. CROSS: Right now, I would like to introduce Carol Becker from the Department of State. She has an interesting proposal to make and would like some feedback from Council and you documents people.

Carol is the Special Assistant to the Historian at the Department of State, and the Historian's Office is responsible for getting out those famous Foreign Relations series that all of us look forward to seeing from time to time, as well as other material. That, primarily, is what we all identify with. Thank you for coming, Carol.

STATEMENT OF CAROL BECKER

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MS. BECKER: Thank you very much, Jennie, for giving me some time today. I'm from the Office of the Historian. As you know, we publish two series of books that most of you give a lot of space to -- the Foreign Relations series has been coming out since 1860. That's 125 years; there are over 300 volumes, and many of the older depositories have all of them.

Another series of books that we put out is the Current Document series. I have all these with me. This series of books has recently been revived. It had stopped for a while. This is the Foreign Relations series, as you know.

The reason I wanted to speak with you today is we've been doing some innovation in those series that, as a librarian, I knew was going to matter to you. I had a hard time convincing some of my colleagues in my office that we had any responsibility after the book was released from GPO.

We should have known, because we've done user surveys, that 80% of the people use them in university libraries. Most of our users are academics, and the reason those books are in the university libraries is because GPO gives them away.

Therefore, it was very important that what you did with the innovations that we're making got our regular users aware

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of what we are doing.

In the Foreign Relations series, one of the new things we're doing is that we've got a new format. You'll see that coming out in early 1986. We've redesigned it with the help of GPO. It's a much more attractive page. It's a different type face, and it's a new subseries on the diplomatic history of the Vietnam War. It will be accelerated.

As you know, we're way behind in the Foreign Relations series. Because of security declassification reasons, we have to wait about thirty years before we can publish. We've gotten permission from the department to accelerate the publishing of the diplomatic history of the Vietnam War.

The volume on '55-'57 will be coming out early in 1986. The volume for '58-'60 will be coming out very shortly after that. We've already compiled through 1965. They'll all come out in the new format. You'll notice that the numbering system will change as well.

Just this past month, just a couple of weeks ago, the final volume in the 1951 series was finally allowed to be published. It's on Eastern Europe. As you might expect, we'd be sensitive to the last Truman volume. That's volume 4. You've had volumes 1 through 15, I think, for a long time; but

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Volume IV has always been missing. Now, you're going to be getting it in the mail pretty soon.

The '55-'57 volumes will start, as I said, with that first Vietnam volume. Instead of maintaining the old numbering system, where the Asian volumes were always the higher-numbered volumes and the European volumes were always the lower-numbered volumes, we're going to number them according to when they're published.

That first volume for '55-'57, Vietnam, will be number one. Internally, this is giving us a really rotten problem on how we keep track of what we're publishing. Before it's published, it has one number; after it's published, it has another number.

The series Current Documents, as I said we've recently revived that. There's a gap between 1966 -- something like that -- and 1976, which we intend to fill in someday. We don't have the resources to do that now.

We are reprinting the first volume in that series called, "A Decade of American Foreign Policy, 1940-1949". It's a new edition. You should be receiving that as a depository item before Christmas.

The most innovative thing we're doing, though, is going

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

into microfiche -- as many of you know, who received, as we call it, the floppy bag right around the first of 1985.

My job is to be involved with all this innovation, and we hired ourselves a microfiche consultant so we could do -- this is the fiche, 150 cards.

This was a new thing for GPO, too, as well as for us. GPO has been in the business for a long time reprinting government documents on microfiche but never appending them as supplements to printed volumes. That's why we're into microfiche. It's not to duplicate what's in the printed volumes, it's to supplement them.

Again, from our user surveys, we've discovered that we have in Washington many things, many documents that are very thorough, especially in this Current Documents series. They disappear after awhile. Sometimes libraries save them; sometimes they don't.

The daily press briefing from the Department of State is of very great interest to scholars. Who saves those? They're given away liberally to the press on the day of the briefing, but who saves them? If you wanted to to do research into that whole topic of press briefings, how would you ever get them all together again?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

That's the type of thing. Whole runs of that type of thing that's in this. It's material that you've never had before out in the depository libraries.

By the way, I brought some lists that we give away of the complete titles from all of our publications. I put them over on the table, and I think they're almost gone. If anybody would like a copy of a list, I'd be glad to furnish it if you could just write to me at the Department of State, Office of the Historian.

Along with the microfiche, we wanted to offer a paper guide. We did some research microfiche, and a consultant told us, "Yes, you have to have a paper guide." Most depository libraries are not going to have two-platform fiche reader, so that you can have the index and the card you want to look at at the same time. They need a guide to look.

What we were doing, then, finally, was making a three-part product. We had a bound book; we had the fiche and we had the paper guide to the fiche.

The British were the first to publish a microform supplement to a documentary history series. I don't know how many of you received that. I don't have the hard book, but I do have their fiche supplement. It looks like this. They

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

meant it to go on the shelf.

In the State Department Library, when this was received, it went to the microform storage area in a metal cabinet. Then, they decided that they didn't have anyplace to put it in there, they were going to put it back on the shelf next to the book.

I went down to the Library of Congress. They didn't know what to do with it either. Finally, they had one of those boxes that fold in on each other and then you have a string that ties it all together -- they put this and the book that it supplements in that unattractive gray box and had to slap a label on it to keep them together.

We saw what happened when you sent out a floppy bag with a 6 x 8 booklet and 4 x 6 fiche. You didn't have a very good container to put it in. Because we want to start issuing supplements to the Foreign Relation series, as well, in microfiche, we thought we had better look at this whole thing a lot more closely and try to figure out what impact we were going to make on the depository libraries when we did this.

Here, you have 120 years of books, and you're now going to start issuing supplements to it in microfiche that in most libraries cannot be shelved near it. We didn't want that, but

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

if we couldn't have that, at least, we wanted to make sure that, intellectually, users would find them.

What would the catalog show when we started to do that? Would there be dummies on shelves? Would there be directional things? I'm a librarian. I know that's a lot of work. You get tons of Government publications everyday. To do that kind of handwork would be very difficult.

I asked around, and we asked Agnes Ferruso from the Library of Congress to please come down and meet with the general editors of our series and with the Historian to our office to ask her what are the implications of what we're doing for depository libraries. What could we do to make it easier for you and more helpful to us to make it be easy for the users?

We talked with her about, perhaps, issuing a notice in Administrative Notes. I didn't even know about Administrative Notes at that point. We talked about what would the possibilities be of Cataloging In Publication. She said that, yes, some government documents do get Cataloging In Publication and if we could put in there a note on the catalog card, "Accompanied by Microfiche Supplement", maybe that would be a signal to user and cataloger and documents librarian alike

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

-- that there was more than one part to this thing.

Eventually, I took the Editor-in-Chief of the Foreign Relations series down to the Library of Congress. Agnes showed us what they had done with the floppy bag in her documents collection. She walked over to the drawer and there in SuDocs number order was the fiche. Then she took me about four stacks away, and there in SuDocs number order was the volume -- that green volume and the pamphlet.

Perfectly logical from a librarian's point of view; but from our point of view, the wrong two things were together. This should have been with the fiche -- from our point of view. We were really in a quandary about what we could do to publish in the way we wanted to publish and make it easy for our users.

We had just about resolved that the only thing we could do was to call the fiche part two to the books part one. That way, at least, you, as librarians and users and catalogers would all presume that if you had a part two that there was a part one.

(Laughter.)

I presume that's a fair assumption.

(Laughter.)

I went to IFLA in August and talked with Mr. Fossedal,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and he suggested that, perhaps, I might want to talk to Charlie McKeown about how marketing could help us at the front end design à product that you would shelve the way we wanted it shelved.

We came up with the idea that, perhaps, the best thing to do after all this research -- the best thing to do was to have some sort of a slipcase that looked like a volume but in effect was a container that was free from dust, free from light, that you'd be willing to put on your shelf right with he printed series. Lo and behold, this was an acceptable idea.

It was a very good meeting. GPO felt they could market something like that. We knew as authors we would be happy producing something like that where it would all be together. We talked with some depository librarians; they agreed that, yes, they'd be willing to shelve it that way.

Charlie authorized the production of a prototype. This may be a much too expensive prototype, but I think we'll eventually end up with something that looks like a Foreign Relations volume. Da-daa!

(Laughter/applause.)

I think the velcro's the neatest thing of all because it keeps it closed. It won't flop open.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Maybe we won't be able to afford ruby buckram, which is what this is.

With the British publication using a vinyl container that has a fiche and the paper guide to the fiche in one thing, we thought that, and Mr. McKeown has agreed to this, that inside the box we will have some sort of a vinyl folder that when you remove the contents of the box, you'll take it all out in one fell swoop; and it'll have the fiche in it and the paper guide.

We're still trying to find people who are in that business of making vinyl folders to customize to specifications.

I don't know when the first time will be that you see this product. We anticipate having three different kinds of microfiche supplements to the Foreign Relations series. The first will be coming out in the spring, I think. The China volume for 1955-57 will have a microfiche supplement.

There was a series of very important talks between the United States Government and the Peoples Republic of China in 1955-57. It was not widely known that there were such talks going on. The minutes of those talks have now been completely declassified.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We can't afford to publish on paper -- it's too expensive. We can afford to do them on fiche. It will be about 30 fiche cards. The only intellectual relationship between the fiche and the book will be in the preface. They can stand alone intellectually.

The second product will also be coming out early in 1986. It's not related to a book at all. In 1945 through 1954, the State Department issued a bulletin, a newsletter, only distributed at the very highest levels. It was very highly classified, and it was called, "Current Economic Developments".

That has now been completely declassified -- the whole ten years of it. That will be coming out in about 75 fiche cards. I assure you that the scholars who are interested in what we do are just really looking forward to that. It opens up a whole new area of information they've never had access to before.

The third type of fiche will accompany the 1963 Vietnam volume. That was the year of the Diem assassination. We can't afford to publish all the documentation for that year. In chronological order, therefore, the documents have been arranged into primary documents and secondary documents.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The more important documents will be published in the book, and very heavy annotation will then direct you to the fiche if you're interested in other documents of that exact day. The cross-referencing will be extreme. That's one of the reasons we wanted so desperately to shelve them together because they have to be used together.

I really welcome your comments on what we're trying to do. I feel very strongly that we're absolutely dependent on your making our work available to the public. I hope that I have a chance to talk with some of you later, that you will write to me with your comments about what we're thinking of doing and I thank you for this opportunity.

(Applause.)

I'd be glad to answer any questions, now, if there's any time.

MS. CROSS: In just a couple of minutes -- we do have one other speaker before we break for lunch. Are there any pressing questions of Council?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: I think that your magic bag of tricks, here, has really been fantastic. If you can be around -- are you planning to be here also this afternoon?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MS. BECKER: I have to go back for a meeting around 2:00 o'clock.

MS. CROSS: You'll at least be here, and someone can see you as soon as this is over. You know her name, and we can get people in touch with you. Thank you, again, so much.

MS. BECKER: Thank you so much.

MS. CROSS: I think it's fantastic; I just really do -- a nice development. Thank you to your office for being so considerate to librarians who want to make this available to users. Sometimes it's very difficult when you have two different formats.

Yesterday, on a couple of occasions, the ondemand system was mentioned. Jay Young who is at GPO has kindly agreed to come and speak to us regarding the ondemand program. Jay, will you yield?

MR. FOSSEDAL: Thank you. I did want to just make a couple of comments -- it'll only take a few seconds. Where did John go?

We did have a few changes over at the Superintendent of Document's office in the sales area. Jay Young, who was previously Director of the Library Programs Service was named to one of the key positions in the sales program, Director of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sales Service. It is a very, very tough job. In the five months that he's been in it, he has been superlative. I'm very proud of the way he has performed and the hours he puts in for which he doesn't get any overtime.

There are two other people here today; and if they're going to be around this afternoon, I'd like you to take the opportunity to talk to them because they are from the sales program and it does impact. Libraries are some of our best customers, and I'd like you to ask them some questions -- perhaps, anything you've ever wondered about.

Why things are priced certain ways? Again, it's a very complicated formula that we have to follow. Ask Barbara Smith when I was asked this question up at Skidmore. It's like, "Oh, boy, I wish you hadn't asked because we're going to design a whole eight-hour course on pricing, so that we can instruct Federal agencies as to the complications."

John Beadle is here. Stand up, will you, John. John has one of the toughest jobs in GPO. He's doing battle, literally, everyday with Federal agencies on the pricing of publications. We have laws and regulations and rules which tell us that we should price publications a certain way. John is the one who has to interface with these agencies everyday,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and I'd like you to have the opportunity to question him on any areas that are of concern to you.

Also, with him, is Lou Reed, who was previously head of our Order Division -- probably the second toughest job over there. Tougher than mine. He's the guy that gets these thirty million letters, or whatever we get a year, or copies to get out. About three or four months ago, we made Lou the head of our ICIS Project, Integrated Customer Information System, which has top support from Mr. Kennickell and the Comptroller, now.

We're really rolling on it, but Lou Reed is going to be in charge of getting this system up along with our Data Systems people. I can only speak of it superficially -- I can sell it; I don't really understand it. If you want to really get an understanding of what we're going to be able to do in two or three years, where we're combining -- I think it's sixteen systems into one system.

Lou Reed, would you stand up. I'd like you to take the opportunity to talk to Lou about what we're going to be able to do in the future.

The only other thing I wanted to say is -- yesterday, I made a statement about going on a visit with some of the inspectors. I love our inspectors. They're doing a fantastic

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

job. I probably made a mistake in saying, "Maybe, they're too high a classification." I admit that. Maybe they're not high enough. I do have an open mind, but I am going to go out and see how these ratings are arrived at.

Make no doubt about it. I think they're great; they work hard. If you don't think so, try to travel all the time for years. They have my backing all the way. I have never changed one category in 150 inspection reports. I completely rely on their judgment and Joe McClane's.

If I slipped up yesterday, I'm sorry. It was no reflection on them. Maybe it's my fault that I don't know more about the inspection process, but that will be taken care of in the next few months or so. Thank you very much for your indulgence.

Jay Young, who I'm very proud of.

(Applause.)

STATEMENT OF JAY YOUNG

MR. YOUNG: It's a pleasure to be back in front of this audience. I know so many people here and so many out there, and it's good to be back. Thank you, Don. I appreciate the comments. There is one other person who's here from Sales Service who I need to introduce, and that's Sarah Wilson.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sarah, would you stand up, please. Sarah's the Chief of our Subscription Section and works for John Beadle, in the Sales Management Division. Sarah is the one who has to deal with the pricing of subscriptions from daily periodicals, basic and supplements, irregulars -- which is a tremendous task in itself.

I asked Sarah to come along because when I finish on talking on ondemand (on demand), if I have time or if not, I'd like to talk with you a little bit about it -- we have gone over the subject of the Monthly Catalog from a sales standpoint and would like to make some suggestions. Okay?

MS. WILSON: Okay.

MR. YOUNG: I could do it in this forum or in the time that we have.

The subject that I was asked to speak about is what we are calling and it's been discussed for sometime -- ondemand service. What ondemand (on demand) means is that we will be making available for sale either in microfiche duplicates or in paper reproduced from microfiche the publications that are now in microfiche in the Library or the Superintendent of Documents' microfiche collection.

Let me mention a couple of things. Ondemand (on demand)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

-- we've kicked that title around to try to come up with a better one. Charlie's looked at it, and, frankly, we haven't come up with it, yet. We're just going to stay with ondemand (on demand) for now.

In terms of spelling, the way we're looking at ondemand (on demand): If we say "new, ondemand service"; therefore, it's an adjective it's going to be one word. If it's an adverb: "how on demand how", it's going to be two words. That's according to the GPO style manual.

(Laughter.)

That's the way we're going there. What I'm saying is you'll be able to purchase copies of documents from our microfiche collection in either fiche or in papercopy reproduced from microfiche.

The key to whole thing is going to be the Monthly Catalog. The Monthly Catalog will serve as the source document from which anyone will be able to ascertain (1) the availability and (2) some idea of the ordering information.

Mark, have the Council been given a copy of the this paper?

MARK: Council has it, but not the general audience.

MR. YOUNG: Council has it, and what I'm interested in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

from the Council -- it has not been distributed, yet -- if it's not clear, I'd be very interested in any thoughts that you all have.

First off, we're saying that when will we commence this? November 1st, this year, 1985.

The first thing that we discuss is the coverage of the collection. As you know, the number of titles in the collection has grown steadily since 1975, when we first began to convert documents to microfiche and we began distributing microfiche copies to the depository libraries instead of paper.

Mark advises me that there are now about 215,000 titles in the collection, and about 22,000 added a year. The collection is organized and is accessible by the SuDoc classification number, and that's it. That's the only access to the microfiche collection.

Just from a standpoint for a general guide of what is covered in the collection: From 1976 through 1980, the coverage is limited, primarily, as you would know, to selected series of documents. What I've done there, Jennie, is provide a list of what things were converted from 1976 up through about 1982 when we started with the Federal Register.

As you know, the first thing was OSHA Health & Safety

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Commission Decisions; then, we went to the Code of Federal Regulations, Postal Service; then, we began to get into some congressional material -- House and Senate hearings, reports and documents; then, on up through the Census Block Statistics; then, we went to the Congressional hearings and, then, the Federal Register in 1982.

So, 1976 through 1980 is the first period that can be identified, and the coverage during that period is limited to a certain group of series. Then, 1981 through 1982, it was in the spring of 1980 that we began a substantial conversion of documents for distribution in microfiche.

Beginning with the January, 1981 Monthly Catalog -- this will be a handout that all of you can have a copy of tomorrow -- the coverages of those documents indicated, the series that I have just discussed, as well as the other documents that we converted to fiche for distribution to the depository libraries; and these documents are identifiable beginning with the January, 1980 Monthly Catalog by the term, "microfiche" shown in the item number section in the entry.

There is a reference method of determining whether those should be available in microfiche. If microfiche is indicated in the item number section of the entry, then, we should have

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

it.

Then, in the spring of 1982, we began another step in conversion to microfiche, and that was conversion and distribution in microfiche to the International Exchange Service libraries throughout the world.

We can say, then, that beginning with the January, 1983 Monthly Catalog, nearly all the remaining documents listed in the Monthly Catalog which were converted for distribution to microfiche to Exchange Libraries, which is just about everything, will be available.

Regretfully, there is no indication in the Monthly Catalog entry to show that availability. However, those not available will generally be the things which couldn't be converted because they had physical characteristics that: they were too big, they had too much color, they were maps -- the types of the things that physically could not be converted to microfiche and didn't make sense, as well as a few limited things that the Library of Congress wanted to leave in paper. Those are popular documents which really don't lend themselves to microfiche, anyway.

Those are the three basic time periods -- '76 through '80, limited; '81 through '82, everything that went to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

depositories; '83 to the present, add now everything that's gone to International Exchange -- to give us a total of in the neighborhood of 215,000 items in the collection.

Now, the best part -- how to order. We have come up with a price. As Don said, our pricing formula is complicated. We have things in the law which we have to abide by, and our Comptroller has given us a price for both fiche duplicates and for, what we call "blowback", reproduction in paper.

The price of a publication will be based on the number of microfiche sheets required or in the case of blowback or hardcopy, the number of pages in the original paper document. Microfiche will be priced at $5.00 per sheet. As you know, a sheet can contain up to 98 pages of text.

Paper copy reproduced through microfiche will cost $10.00 for the first 32 pages, plus $2.00 for each additional 16 pages or fraction thereof. These prices include delivery by first class mail. We figure if somebody wants this kind of service, they're willing to pay for first class mail.

Just from the standpoint of what does that mean. An average Government document is 160 pages; so, that comes out, if I recall, that 160-page document blown back into paper from microfiche will be $26.00. That would be an average cost of a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

blowback document into a hardcopy -- about $26.00.

Only orders for complete documents can we handle. In other words, we won't be able to deal with individual pages or chapters for this service -- only complete documents.

Things that we currently sell in the Sales Program won't be available in fiche. However, there will be many titles that have gone out of print that will now be available through this service.

The way I look at it in terms of what this service is going to do: It's going to fill in the gap between what we have in the Sales Program right now, and, then, over here on the other side is the technical documentation that NTIS sells.

What we have, then, is we'll be selling what fills in the gap between current sales products in paper, NTIS on demand and, then, the gap of things that NTIS hasn't picked up because they weren't essentially technical -- a lot of administrative materials and that which you're very familiar with that are in our collection. That's the niche that we'll be filling with this service.

When ordering, you're going to have to specify the medium desired -- whether you want microfiche duplicates or

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

paper blown back from microfiche. Then, we must have the information from the document entry in the Monthly Catalog. We're going to have to have the SuDoc's class number; we need the title; we need the Monthly Catalog issue date and we need the Monthly Catalog entry number.

All of that will help us. Obviously, we can find it with the class number; but if we can go right to the Monthly Catalog entry, that's a big help. I just want to say it's not possible to process an order without the class number. If we don't get that class number, if we have to do -- I'm hedging on whether we'll do research or not.

I don't want to because I think it would be too expensive and it would take too long for us to do that. We think that if anybody wants this service, we're going to have educated users -- they can come to you -- who are going to be able to find that document in the Monthly Catalog and give us that class number.

The number of pages shown in the monthly catalog -- I talked about pricing is based on pages -- as you know, the number of pages in the Monthly Catalog can only serve as a guide to estimating the cost because it's not always specifically the actual number of pages you have. You have i,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ii and iii and that sort of thing in the Monthly Catalog entry.

In many cases, you won't be able to determine the specific number of pages; so, therefore, what we're proposing is that anybody who wants this service is encouraged to authorize payment through a deposit account or a VISA, MasterCard or CHOICE -- and trust us to know how many pages there are and charge accordingly.

I don't know how else to do it. We cannot accept checks or money orders, except if you've called in and gotten a price quote and you have the exact amount from that price quote. That's the only way we could accept a check or money order for this service.

We hope that you or anybody would use a deposit account or a VISA, MasterCard and we now have CHOICE. I don't know if that's all out, but we do have CHOICE as a new service.

For calling for a price quote -- what we'll have to do is: Generally, we'll have to take the order and call you back because in most cases we're going to have to go over there and look at that actual fiche file and see if it's there. This means we're over here in Union Center Plaza, and the fiche file is over here. We'll be sending people back and forth to do that.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For making the microfiche duplicates, those will be made on the LPS duplicator, right here. For making blowback copies, we have a XEROX 970, which is located on the fifth floor of Union Center Plaza. We've already started the blowback service for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Publications, and, frankly, we're getting more orders than we ever thought we would. Maybe 25 a week -- which is more than we expected.

We have established help for telephone calls and getting orders, so that orders for this service won't come in through our regular, massive amount of mail.

We'll have special telephone numbers. I'll give them now. The numbers will be: 275-2060 and 275-2171, both 202 area code. They should be used for ordering and requesting costs or inquiring about the service.

Written orders will come to a special box that we've established, which will be Post Office Box 37082, Washington, D.C. 20013-7082, nine digits.

That's what this document that we've spent a lot of time working on and had to kick around a tremendous amount among ourselves to try to decide how we could do this. Essentially, the way we decided to do it was just to do it, and see what happens.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I don't think this service is not going to be at these rates -- it's not going to be a way for you to fill claims. It's too expensive. It is going to be a way for you to handle and get copies of things that have been lost, stolen, that are important to you.

Questions, please? Yes, madam.

MS. EISENBEIS: One suggestion, Jay -- I work at a large academic library where we have patrons who want to buy the material themselves. Two companies have come up with a pad, tear-off sheet, 8-1/2 x 11, that we keep at the reference desk and tear off and hand them order sheets. Have you designed an order sheet?

Can't you work a page-range formula like NTIS does, so that on every issue of GRA+I, we can go to the page range with a code and get the price and plug that in and get the --

MR. YOUNG: We have the page range, really. It's $5.00 per page.

MS. EISENBEIS: I know you do, but what I'm saying --

MR. YOUNG: We can make up something that spells that out a little better.

MS. EISENBEIS: -- we need a visual. We need something that is automatic, go-to-reference and a pad that we can tear

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

off and hand the patron a form, because I anticipate my need in a large academic library as meeting a user request for a document that they want.

I mean they don't blink at $25.00. That's not something that, I think, is going to stop anybody from getting this material. I'd be glad to work you with on that.

MR. YOUNG: I think that's a good idea. I'd like to have your ideas on that. So, the order form -- is Charlie still here?

MR. McKEOWN: Yes, sir -- taking notes on speakers.

MR. YOUNG: Good.

(Laughter.)

MR. YOUNG: What we're going to do after you all have looked at this and we've agreed, Charlie will then sit down with this -- what I just went over will appear in Admin Notes -- this is aimed at you all. Then, Charlie's going to sit down and come up with another version, which will be the public version because everybody else is not going to understand what International Exchange is.

So, order form pads and a range on prices -- okay.

MR. WALTER: I assume from your description, here, that anything that does not have a bullet will not be available --

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

is that correct -- in the Monthly Catalog.

MR. YOUNG: No, I didn't say that. Not at all. If it has microfiche in the record, then that meant it was distributed to the depository libraries, and that will be available.

What we said when we started with International Exchange was that we were going to be converting 90%. I think it's greater. Essentially, everything will be, except those things, like I said, are physically not suitable to have been microfilmed or very popular-type things that the Library of Congress did not want microfiched.

It's essentially most everything that's in the catalog. Regretfully, that once past the bullets and microfiching the record, there's nothing in the catalog that's going to indicate that for you.

Anything else?

MS. CROSS: Anyone in the audience with a burning question, here?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: There will be copies of this with the information -- everything that Jay has discussed -- so that we will have available to distribute tomorrow. You will get all

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the phone numbers, the pricing, the three categories of material available.

I do want to talk to you about the pricing in the Monthly Catalog. I don't believe we have time, here, right now. We are going to have to adjust our afternoon just a wee bit. We have an hour for lunch. I know that does somewhat rush you, but we have a big program this afternoon, and we don't want to impose on our speakers to delay them too much. Please be back at 1:15, and we'll try to get started as soon as possible after that. Thank you very much.

(Lunch break.)

MS. CROSS: Good afternoon. It's good to see you back -- a few empty chairs, but I think they'll fill up momentarily. We have four speakers this afternoon, all of whom we will have an opportunity to ask questions. The way we're structuring this is that each person will make their presentation: then, depending on the time, we probably will have a break; then, we will reconvene and then have a question-and-answer period.

I've asked Katie Lewin from the Office of Management and Budget to go first because she is going to be speaking in relationship to the new OMB Circular, which has not yet been published. Katie is Management Analyst in the Information

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Policy Branch at the Office of Management and Budget. She is also a librarian, and she has very graciously consented to fill in for Tim Sprehe, who could not be here today.

She will be followed by Thomas Kleis, who is the Staff Director of the Joint Committee on Printing, and, then, David Peyton, who is Director of Government Relations of the Information Industry Association. Then, finally, we will hear from Toni Bearman, who is the Executive Director of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. She has been there for five years, and she is also a librarian.

I think we're very fortunate to have such an outstanding group on such an important topic of which we're all very, very interested -- the OMB Circular on Information Management in Government. Without saying more, we will begin. Katie, we're pleased to have you with us.

STATEMENT OF KATIE LEWIN

MS. LEWIN: Thank you. I'm pleased to represent OMB here today. Before we get into discussing particular points of the Information Policy Circular, I'd like to consider the Circular as a whole. Although I did work with Tim Sprehe in developing the Circular, certainly, he deserves the majority of the credit for getting it this far.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As I'm sure you know, this was an enormous task that encompasses in a single document many information policy areas not integrated before. This is OMB's attempt to revise and consolidate a single document -- Federal Policy on Privacy, Records Management, Computer Security, Software Management, Computer and Telecommunication Management, Federal Information Telecommunications Standards and Interagency Sharing of Computer and Telecommunications Facilities. It's a very large undertaking.

The draft circular -- and, right now, let me preface my remarks by saying that when I refer to the draft circular in my remarks, I'm talking about the new draft, not the one that was published in March. The one that was published in March has been revised and will eventually be published, again. I'm referring to the new version, the revised version.

The draft circular establishes policy in two broad areas: information management and information systems and technology management. As regarding information management, agencies are required to create, collect, process, disseminate information only where a basis for these activities exist in statute or in agency missions.

In particular, agencies have to show that information

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

dissemination activities are essential to their mission, non-duplicative of other information products and services, accomplished cost effectively including imposing user charges where appropriate, conducted with maximum feasible reliance on the private sector and subject to periodic review as the need for and manner of dissemination.

As regards information systems and technology management, agencies have to establish planning processes and management controls for information technology, make program officials accountable for information systems, require acquisition of off-the-shelf software where available rather than custom development, require appropriate security for information systems, require full-cost accounting for information technology facilities and realize savings wherever possible through application of up-to-date information technology.

Since the publication of the draft circular on March 15th, OMB has received over 350 comments, and you can be sure that Tim has read every single one of them. I, unfortunately, have not. 52% of those comments were from librarians and academics; 28% from other members of the public and 20% from Federal agencies and Members of Congress.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I am going to talk about particular changes to the Circular, but, in general, let me say that in response to these comments, the Circular has been revised to be more positive, less restrictive and more supportive of the depository library system.

I know that you're anxious for the publication of the revised Circular; however, no publication date has been set. Members of the Congress and the public have urged that OMB publish another draft for public comment. OMB has not committed to publishing another draft.

As you know, James Miller was recently sworn in as our new Director, and Wendy Grant has been appointed to the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. These new policy officials make the decision as to whether or not another round of comments will occur.

We do have a revised draft ready for their review, but there's been no decision, yet. In addition, I would remind you that we've already been through two public-comment periods. After publication of the initial notice on September 23rd, 1983, and, again, after the publication of the draft circular on March 15th, 1985.

I know Tim has had numerous meetings with all groups who

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

expressed an interest in discussing these topics. I think it's been a fairly open process, at least so far.

The structure of the revised circular is basically the same as that of the one published in March. We have retained and revised the preamble to the March version and incorporated it as an appendix entitled, "Analysis of Key Sections".

The revised circular also emphasizes its relationship to the Paperwork Reduction Act.

Let me just quote from the revised circular and give you sort of the tenor of what I think it says and that is: "Nothing in this circular is intended to diminish or derogate the creation or collection of information, nor to serve as a pretext under which a federal agency could damage the nation's critical need by failing to create or collect information."

I'm going to discuss specific parts. Obviously, I'm not going to go through the entire circular, but things that I thought would be of interest to the Council members. The most important question being, I think, in your minds: What is our support of depository libraries?

Many librarians who commented on the draft circular recommended that the Circular incorporate specific language that would strengthen the depository library program. They

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

argued that depository libraries constitute an existing institutional mechanism guaranteeing that executive agency publications are accessible to the general public -- a kind of information safety net.

OMB staff agreed with this recommendation and has incorporated into the revision language that would require executive agencies to establish procedures for making their publications available to the depository library program through GPO. Providing such publications to the depository library program complies with the law and costs agencies virtually nothing.

Douglas Ginsberg, who was the past Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, announced in a speech before the ALA on July 6th and in testimony before Congressman Barney Frank on July 17th that OMB would work with GPO to develop guidelines as to what kinds of documents should be made available to the Depository Library Program.

The pertinent text of Ginsberg's July 17th testimony is as follows: "We have begun discussions with GPO and JCP as to how we can jointly settle this problem of supplying the depository libraries with the publications they should be receiving.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"In its December, 1984 report, the General Accounting Office suggested that GPO provide guidelines to executive agencies as to just what sorts of documents belong to the depository libraries. We have agreed to work together immediately with GPO to assist in developing these guidelines.

"Once they are developed, OMB will promulgate the guidelines for application to executive agencies and actively require compliance. How will OMB work with GPO?

"We understand that the Public Printer has formed an advisory council consisting of representatives from the Federal Publishers Committee. As far as OMB is concerned, these representatives who are publishing officers from executive agencies can provide the necessary executive branch input to the GPO guidelines.

"OMB will reserve the right of review over the GPO guidelines document before promulgating the document for compliance by executive agencies; but OMB anticipates that if the advisory council passes favorably on the document, OMB will pass favorably on it, as well."

I'd like to, now, discuss several controversial areas of the draft circular and how the revised circular addresses them. The basic considerations and assumption section has been

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

amended and broadened to reflect points raised in comments; namely, that the statements were too narrow.

This section has been reformulated based on tentative Paperwork Reduction Act. To quote from the revised draft: "The free flow of information from the Government to its citizens, and vice versa, is essential to a democratic society. It is also essential that the Government minimize the Federal paperwork burden on the public, minimize the cost of this information activities and maximize the usefulness of Government information."

These concepts of minimizing cost of information and the paperwork burden on the public and maximizing the usefulness of information comes directly from the Paperwork Reduction Act.

Commentators on this section objected to the application of cost benefit analysis to the Government information activities. Many stated that the benefits of Government information cannot be easily calculated and that such information holds more benefits than simply economic.

Recalling that the statement is an assumption underlying policy, not in itself a policy, OMB notes that the statement does not preclude the existence of benefits other than economic, such as the value of information to citizens' needing

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

information about their government, information as a way to insure the accountability of Government and information as a tool for effective government management.

Nor does it necessarily presuppose that benefits can be easily calculated. The statement has been revised to incorporate by reference the purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act cited in the preceding statement. Insuring that benefits exceed costs insofar as those are calculable is the means to minimizing burdens and costs and maximizing usefulness.

The policy section was by far the most controversial, especially the sections on information management and information dissemination. Many commentators believed that the formulation of a statement on information collection and sharing in the draft circular was too narrow and restrictive; that, in fact, the circular would limit the collection of information by federal agencies more than was intended by the Paperwork Reduction Act.

The revised policy statement used the expression, "necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency", which is taken directly from the language of the Paperwork Reduction Act, and introduces a requirement for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

practical utility, also taken from the same sections of the Act.

Some commentators believed that the language should be couched in even broader terms, such as information needed by society or the general public. The intent of the Act, however, was to circumscribe not to broaden agency discretion, to (inaudible) information collection and (inaudible) burdens on the public.

The Act intends that the creation or collection of information be carried out within the context of efficient, effective and economical management. When Federal agencies create or collect information, just as when they perform any other function, they consume scarce resources, and such activities must be continually scrutinized in light of good management principles.

The applicable principles provided and the purposes of the Act are, again, to minimize the Federal paperwork burden, to minimize the cost to the Federal Government of collecting, maintaining, using and disseminating information and to maximize the usefulness of information collection by the Federal Government.

Agencies must justify the creation or collection of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

information in the light of their statutory functions. The revised circular uses the standard of "necessary for the proper performance of agency functions" taken directly from the Act.

Further, the policy statement includes the requirement that the information have practical utility as defined in the Act. Note that the practical utility includes characteristics pertaining to the quality of information, such as accuracy, adequacy and reliability.

The statements on information dissemination received the most comments. First, I would like to clarify the concept of access to information and dissemination of information as used in the circular.

The first drafts of the circular made the distinction between these two concepts but didn't establish a relationship. As defined in the Circular, access to information refers to the function of providing members of the public upon their request the Government information to which they are entitled under law.

The term dissemination of information refers to the function of distributing Government information to the public, but how does the public know what information is available from Federal agencies? That is, given the distinction the Circular

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

makes between access and dissemination, what is the relationship between the two? How does the public know what Government it may access?

The answer is: Through the Government's dissemination of information on what is available. How do I access it? The Freedom of Information Act requires each agency to publish currently in the Federal Register descriptions of agency organization, where and how the public may obtain information, the general course and methods by which agency functions are determined, including all procedural requirements.

The Privacy Act also requires publication of information concerning systems of records. The Sunshine Act requires agencies to make public announcement of meetings. In addition, the Paperwork Reduction Act requires agencies to publish notices when they submit information collections for OMB approval.

In sum, every Federal agency has obligations to disseminate basic information to the public concerning what the agency does, how its programs operate, what the public must do to comply with laws or regulations, how to receive benefits, how the public can use agency services -- these obligations are the basic link between access to and dissemination of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Government information.

Beyond generic requirements, specific laws affect agency dissemination of information in two ways: First, for some agencies their basic enabling legislation stipulates that information dissemination is part of their statutory mission. General purpose statistical agencies, for example, have information dissemination as part of their very reason for existence.

Second, statutes may sometimes require that agencies produce and disseminate specific information products or services. For example, the law may state that the President or head of an agency shall make reports to the Congress on given subjects. These will be legally required dissemination of information.

In addition to generic and specific statutory requirements, agencies have positive obligations to disseminate information as a necessary part of performing their function. Each agency head must clarify the nature of these obligations for the agency's particular mission and set appropriate boundaries for dissemination functions.

Before deciding to disseminate any information, product or service, and periodically thereafter, an agency must be able

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to demonstrate the dissemination of product or service passes the test of either being required by law or be necessary for the proper performance of agency function.

In conformity with the purposes of the public, the Paperwork Reduction Act, the agency's positive obligations to disseminate information must be discharged within a responsible management framework of minimizing cost to the Federal Government while maximizing the usefulness of this information.

Efficient, effective and economical dissemination does not translate into diminishing or limiting the flow of information from the agency to the public. To the contrary -- good management of information resources should result in more useful information flowing with greater facility to the public at less cost to the taxpayer than does a poor management of information process.

Given an adequate basis for dissemination, agencies must also ask themselves whether a proposed or existing information product duplicates similar products or services that would otherwise be available either from another agency or from the private sector.

This requirement of non-duplicative resources originating in the Paperwork Reduction Act husbands scarce

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

resources and leaves more efficient and effective information dissemination by the government.

The question of dissemination also gave rise to the misconception that the Circular will require agencies to do away with many of its information products and services. This is not true. The Circular advocates the use of adequate notice with any new product or discontinuation of an existing one.

Because Government information activities are important to the Government and to the public, agencies must exercise care not to act capriciously with respect to information products and services.

When agencies intend to commence offering new products or services, they should provide adequate advance notice, so the public may comment as to the need for the product or service. For example, if the private sector (inaudible) if they are either offering or about to offer the same or about to offer the same or similar product or service, such notice will allow these interests to present their case before the product or service is launched.

By the same token, if many members of the public greatly depend on a particular product or service, they should be permitted to voice their views to an agency that is

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

contemplating termination of a product or service.

The Circular refers to significant information, products and services. It is not the Circular's intent that agency should follow notice-and-comment procedures when terminating relatively inconsequential information products.

Agencies must determine for themselves whether information products are significant and, in some cases, may wish to establish procedures for making such determinations.

This is just a brief summary of the revised Circular, touching only on a few of the more important points. OMB has tried to be responsive to the comments received; and I think, in the case of the depository libraries and support for this program, you will agree we have been successful.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

STATEMENT OF THOMAS J. KLEIS

MR. KLEIS: Good afternoon. I don't think I've ever addressed this group in my 3-1/2 years as Staff Director of the Joint Committee on Printing. I guess I have to apologize for that because I think I should have. This, I think, provides a good forum for talking to you.

I can see that OMB took to heart a lot of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

recommendations that were made by the library community out there. OMB's Tim Sprehe, in fact, talked to me a couple of months ago and said they were concerned about a lot of the comments, particularly the depository libraries and that they would take steps in the new draft Circular to promote the concept of depository libraries.

I think, clearly, if they could see it coming out of Congressional appropriations rather than out of agency budgets, there would be a good reason for them to do that. I think that makes sense. With the pledge of OMB, GPO and JCP and other groups will be developing a set of guidelines, if you will, for what constitutes a depository library publication.

OMB, as Katie said, would endorse and even promulgate these guidelines as a way to insure compliance on the part of the agency. I think that's a very positive step.

One thing, though, that she didn't address, and I'm not sure in the new Circular and I'm not sure whether it is a part of the Circular or not, but one of our biggest concerns on the Joint Committee on Printing is that there is really no mention in real terms of JCP, GPO or that earlier section of Title 44 that deals with the methods of production and dissemination of Government information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

If, indeed, OMB wants greater dissemination of the information, I guess we wonder why it would not cite the relevant sections of Title 44 that show what mechanisms already exist for that widespread dissemination of information. That is a concern of ours, and I'm not sure to what extent -- we can probably get into it in questions and answers -- that may have been addressed in the new draft Circular.

We have, not formally -- the chairman of the committee has not formally made it known to the head of OMB, but in informal discussions with OMB, we have made it clear that that is one of our objections to the Circular as it exists.

I guess it does talk about some of the products that would be considered information in a tangible form -- paper, microform, magnetic tape, computerized database, hardware and software used to produce it, etc. -- but, again, it never mentions any requirement that the final product be produced and disseminated by or through GPO.

It does not mention that GPO can procure a complete product from the keying in to the indexing to the multiple products or that GPO also sells data on electronic tape. I think these are omissions that would be well to be included in the Circular if, indeed, dissemination of information to the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

public is the goal of the Circular.

The depository library issue has been taken care of, I suppose, and until we see the final version, I don't know that I can say more than that. It seems like a very positive step forward.

There are some other provisions of Title 44, such as Section 1300 which really talks about all the statutory requirements for annual reports and other publications, which might be well to be referenced in the Circular to call it to the attention to the agencies of their statutory requirements and, in cases where they may not know them.

One other issue, I guess, that we think is a problem, too, is in philosophical discussions with people at OMB, it seems to be some distinction in their mind about electronic media and print media as if they're something totally different. We don't think they are. We think a publication is a publication, no matter what form it's in.

The tone of the older Circular as it exists -- I'll have to reserve judgment until I see the new one -- in our view puts the demand of electronic dissemination in the hands of the agencies and regulation by OMB, rather than through the Government Printing Office. Again, philosophically, we tend to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

disagree with that.

We think all media affords distribution of Government information, symbols on any media, if you will, are susceptible to distribution and dissemination through GPO.

Again, there was mention in the older circular about user fees, and the Joint Committee on Printing has always come out against that as a viable way of charging the public for information.

We have a Sales Program through the Superintendent of Documents. It is set up by law to be self-sustaining. All information and there were publications, if you will, that are distributed to the public for sale should go through the GPO to insure broadest base for cost recovery.

User fees are a concept that does not fit in with that, and we feel could be considered somewhat arbitrary if they were set by agencies on an ad hoc basis.

I guess those really are our main objections to the OMB Circular -- some of them more philosophical than they are substantive, I suppose; but, again, the new Circular may have corrected some of these problems. I think we may talk a little bit more about that in discussion. Thank you.

(Applause.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATEMENT OF DAVID PEYTON

MR. PEYTON: Good afternoon. For those of you who are not already familiar with the Information Industry Association, why don't I take just a minute or two to tell you a bit about who we are.

The Information Industry Association represents over 400 companies which are actively pursuing business opportunities related to the collection, storage, access to and dissemination of information in all subject matter and in all media.

Our companies are actively involved in specific subject areas that correspond to the functions of a number of Federal agencies in securities and financial information, in transportation, for example. Also our companies are users of the output of a number of Federal agencies, especially the statistical agencies for demographic and economic purposes.

We have a strong interest in Government-produced information from both angles. Before going to the Circular itself, I think it might be helpful to look at some of the background of Federal information policy, and there is quite a bit of background to it.

By now, almost a decade, the first major Federal statement on information policy was, as I recall, the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Rockefeller Report". That was the staff headed by Quincy Rogers which came out in 1976.

The second effort came out of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration -- the publication called, "Issues and Information Policy" which came out in 1981. A digested version of that was taken to the OECD as a statement of what the Federal Government saw as the principal basis for information policy or policies in the United States of America.

Also, the Office of Technology Assessment, as you may know, has done a series of studies in various information-policy-related areas. The term, although it's a singular, really has a plural concept behind it.

There are numerous important Federal statutes which, together, make up information policy. Starting back with the First Amendment, that's information policy, and the Copyright Act, the Freedom of Information Act, the Privacy Act, the Paperwork Reduction Act, all these things contribute to what we call, very easily, Federal information policy.

As far as we can tell, then, the new OMB Circular really has been in the works for a long time. The new Circular has its roots very strongly in several of these basic Federal

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

statutes, such as FOIA, Privacy and the Paperwork Reduction Act.

We think that it's very timely that OMB is coming out with a broad information policy document which is covering a wide variety of subjects from ADP procurement to computer security to privacy and, also, the subjects of more particular interest to us here today -- information and collection and dissemination.

Not only are we in favor of the basic effort, but we also think that OMB, having put a great deal of effort and thought into it, has basically gotten it right. We see the Circular as an administrative and management document and not as a budgetary document.

I think there's been some misimpression along these lines. Certainly, The Washington Post editorial, for example, could have given some readers the impression that there was some budgetary import to the OMB Circular, which is not the case.

Our companies would never be happy, for example, about cutbacks in important Government statistical publications, such as BLS Monthly Labor Review, which seems to have become something of a celebrated case, because our companies which add

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

value to data like this, which rely on data put out by mutual authoritative Federal agencies -- such as BLS and Census -- can't really function terribly well without the basic statistical output from the Government.

We're not happy when cutbacks like that occur although that, we think, is a somewhat separate issue of Federal funding constraints. Choices having to be made about where things will be cut has to be made in any kind of Federal agency.

Many Government agencies do have mission, goals, objective and requirements to disseminate information. It's written into their organic statutes with language like: "The Secretary may," or "the Secretary shall compile an index or disseminate information."

That's an important part of what the agency exists to do. However, even when there are these goals, objectives and requirements that are part of the agency's reason for being, that doesn't necessarily mean that the agency has to accomplish those goals by means of a direct Government operation or a Government enterprise in information dissemination -- whether in traditional publication or in electronic media.

We recognize that Government agencies have unique

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

advantages in collecting information. That's because the Government is a neutral actor in no way that a private company is ever going and, hence, seen as trustworthy. The Government is able to assure the confidentiality of information that's collected -- the Census being a shining example.

Also, of course, the Government has the unique capability to command certain reporting take place. There are many agencies who do this, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission. We see the Circular as being in favor of the intelligent exercise of the Government's powers in this regard.

On the other hand, it's our view that, when it comes to dissemination, the Government agencies don't have the same kind of advantages. Indeed, we don't think when it comes to dissemination that any one organization, whether a Government agency or a private company, is capable of meeting the diverse needs of various kinds of users.

Just think of who the users are for almost any kind of information. Lots of them come into the depository library, and we see, even in different specialized areas, the variety of needs that occur. Take, for example, financial and securities information which is a current subject because of the automation efforts at the Securities and Exchange Commission.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

People have very different needs, depending on whether they are brokers, depending on whether they're stock analysts doing research, depending on whether it's an individual private investor, depending on whether it's a business school faculty member somewhere. The information is by no means going to be necessarily in the same format, of the same timeliness, of the same depth or what have you.

The only way that the various needs of all these diverse users in any subject area, we think, can be met is through the active interplay between a variety of suppliers and the users who they serve. The only way that can happen is for a variety of entrepreneurs to take risks, to put out products, to suffer the failure, to reap the rewards of successes and have one leap frog another with an innovation in an ongoing process that doesn't have any end.

We think that OMB, basically, has recognized the advantages of this kind of dynamic interplay between a variety of suppliers and users in writing this Circular. The part on information dissemination calls for agencies to conserve resources and for agencies to share, where that's appropriate -- and there are some successful examples of that -- and, also, where there are private services which are germane to the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

agency's objectives that the agency rely, where appropriate, on already existing private sector services and products or where there are planned services and products factor them into their operations, as well.

Typically, there will be some overlap between what's privately provided for private users and what the Government wants without being a complete overlap. Because Government agencies do have unique missions, it's very likely that they'll have some requirement that are not mirrored anywhere in the private sector.

Where that case comes, then the Government agencies need to do a canvas$ if you will, service by service and feature by feature of what's privately provided and see what the Government needs that it can't get anywhere else, and, then, add its demands to the private demands, so that there's a useful aggregate that arises.

With respect to our comments, in particular on the Circular -- in 1983, we filed very extensive comments with OMB when the first notice came out in the Federal Register. I believe it was the most extensive set of comments of any group.

Our emphasis, at that point, was on user fees. We provided a very detailed history of user-fee policies in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Federal Government, and we urged that it was appropriate that information services be subject under some conditions to user fees. OMB reached the same conclusion that we did.

We also filed comments again this year -- one of the 350 some, and we addressed the user-fee issue, again. Although, this time, the tenor was somewhat different because OMB has accepted the idea that information products and services, as we believe they should be, are appropriate subject matter for user fees in the same way that Federal land is for sheep or cattle grazing out in the West.

Two things can go wrong with Federal user fees. The first is that they could be too low. In this case, especially, if an agency were setting up a new information enterprise going off-premises with a value-added electronic service, for example, the Government could engage in predatory behavior -- just the same as a large corporation could engage in predatory behavior with a smaller competitor.

The Government has access to non-market sources of capital through taxation. When there is a tax-subsidized price, the market effect of that is just the same as if it were a large, private corporation taking a temporary loss. It is predatory conduct, and that should be guarded against.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

On the other hand, we also recognize that user fees can be too high. There has been some discussion recently of Government charging for information on value-based prices, and we are firmly against that. We testified last year at some length on this point, with respect to the Freedom of Information Act amendments.

Whenever the Government sets a price above the real cost of production and attempts to sustain that against any kind of resale, the Government agency involved necessarily places itself in the position of asserting a proprietary interest in the information content.

This is exactly what the public domain policy of the Copyright Act is against. Section 105 of the Copyright Act says that, "No copyright subsists in works of the United States Government." That is, employees who are doing full-time activities in writing reports or what have you -- there are no copyright rights in the output of those activities. That is as it should be.

The logical concomitant of that is that Government agencies cannot and should not attempt to charge any price that's above the logically attributable costs of the information involved.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There's only one exception that I know of to that, and that's the Standard Reference Data Act, applying to the National Bureau of Standards with certain technical information about metal properties -- for example, where there's a very narrow basis of interest. Congress made a determination that the cost of doing that research be as could appropriately be recovered from the users. Other than that one specific instance, there's no basis for value-based pricing.

We also commented about the need for procedures in the OMB Circular to give substance and effect to what we saw as the intent of the policies being put out in the Circular. We are in favor of the notice-and-comment procedure in the Federal Register, both with regard to any publication being dropped or discontinued or cutback and also with respect to any new program that any agency feels that it would need to commence in order to meet its missing objectives.

In each case, there would be an opportunity for people in the private sector to say: "This document is extremely valuable. Don't discontinue it. We rely on it for uses A, B and C. Or, on the other hand, for the agency to collect information, which it may not have at its fingertips, already, about private sector services and products which are

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

potentially germane to its mission objectives.

Finally, with respect to the breadth of the OMB Circular. It is, indeed, a very broad document as it must be because of the breadth and scope of the field which it attempts to cover. It's not immediately clear how all these principles, which it seems to us are pretty hard to argue with -- from life cycle IRM costs figuring into pricing protection or what have you -- it's not exactly clear how all these principles will be applied in practice in dubious cases or close questions in the future.

There may, indeed, be a need for OMB to articulate further exactly the guidance that it's giving to agencies. A good example of that would be with regard to what are now being called electronic filing systems -- the mixed use database automation projects taking place in agencies like the SEC, which I mentioned before, the Patent and Trademark Office, the Federal Maritime Commission, the Department of Transportation and probably a number of other agencies in the future, such as the Department of Labor.

OMB, we think, was quite wise to say that they were not going to make any specific guidance about these new systems with which we have very little experience; that the same basic

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

broad policies that apply to hardcopy products would apply to electronic dissemination and, as there's more experience and more policy development in the future, then, it may be appropriate for OMB to address electronic filing or any other new development in more detail.

That's our view on the Circular, and I'll be glad to take your questions afterwards.

(Applause.)

STATEMENT OF TONI BEARMAN

MS. BEARMAN: There were times I wish I were Shiva, many-handed goddess, as you may remember, trying to take notes and being the last on the panel to revise the comments I was going to make to refer back to what everyone had previously had said.

It's, as always, a pleasure to be back before this very distinguished group and to see so many familiar faces here. I was thinking as I was coming over today that I have now been with the Government almost five years. November 16th is my fifth anniversary although I was hired in September five years ago.

When I had been in my job just a couple of weeks the last meeting of the Public Sector-Private Sector Task Force was

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

held. It was my first meeting of that group and their last. We had arranged, under our previous chairman, Charles Benton, for some people to come for lunch that day.

There was a very distinguished gentleman named Ken Allen, who was at OMB at the time and now is at IIA. As a matter of fact, it was Jim Tozi and John McNichols from OMB. The day we had lunch was the day that President Carter signed something called, "Public Law 96-511, The Paperwork Reduction Act".

There was a lot of discussion about what that would mean for people, and some of the folks at OMB said, "Information resource management -- what is all this? We're talking about information policy. Can you help us?" I happen to have a PH.D. in the management of information resources which I received in 1977. Theoretically, I'm supposed to know something about the area.

That seems as though it was forever ago. It also seems as though it were yesterday. Here we are not only referring back to some of the changes that have come about from Public Law 96-511, but also looking, yet again, at the revised Circular -- and I am anxiously awaiting the new revision -- I was dutifully taking notes as fast as I could -- Katie, I wish

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I took shorthand. There were some very, very good points being made there.

First of all, I would really like to commend OMB, as we did in our comments to OMB, for the openness with which they have gone through this entire procedure for issuing drafts in the Federal Register; for giving us sixty days to comment; for saying to people, "Well, if you can't get them in immediately that day, take a little more time if you need it;" for coming to meetings like this; for having Mr. Ginsberg come out to ALA.

I think the whole process has been very open, which, of course, is the the way it should be in our Government. It is not easy, I know, Katie, coming in to talk to people about something that not everyone agrees with.

I remember when I went to meet with Roland Brown recently -- well, it was about a year ago now, and I think it was right after they had copyrighted their database -- and I went into see him, and I said, "Roland, I promise I will not discuss abortion and copyright. He laughed and felt very happy about it.

(Laughter.)

I know, Katie, you must feel sometimes as though you're

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

eing thrown to the lions, but I assure you that you are before a group of professional librarians and other information professionals. They're not at all lions, and I think we're going to have a very good discussion this afternoon.

I'm also very pleased to be on this panel and to have the opportunity to tell you a little bit about some of our comments from the Commission. I'm sure all of you do know the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is a Federal agency established by law to advise both the executive and the legislative branches on policy and planning and the entire library and information field .

Also, by law, we work with, of course, the entire library community and with the information industry. We're among many friends and colleagues here today.

What I want to do is take just a couple of moments to review for you some our comments on the earlier draft. I feel as though I'm commenting today on a ten-year-old version of a textbook because it does sound as though some significant changes have been made from the earlier draft.

I thought you might be interested to know what the Commission said. I have about thirty copies of our comments with me. We submitted our comments on May 14, which was

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

between two Commission meetings. I sent them into OMB. At our last Commission meeting, the Commission discussed them and endorsed them, and they were transmitted from our chairman to the acting director of OMB as the official comments of the Commission.

We begin with a commendation to OMB, again, for the openness of the process that they have gone through and thanking them for their willingness to meet with people in the community and to receive comments and actually do something about them. It's one thing to get comments; it's more important to make changes based on them.

We feel that the issues in this Circular are so important that we need more than just comments in writing. We offer to provide a forum, again, as part of our law and our responsibility for OMB, to assist them in having hearings -- the Commission, by law, can conduct hearings -- and to assist in anyway to get additional ideas and comments from the library and information community.

We pointed out the need for some clarifications. We feel very strongly about there being some distinctions that need to be made among types of information.

There are many kinds of information, such as: private

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

information about an individual; information that must be kept secret because it relates to our National Defense; proprietory information from a company which is sort of on the one side and then, on the other side, there's information that should be widely disseminated -- anything your Government does that is not required to be kept secret.

I do not mean that all information about what we do -- every word and every minute ever taken, obviously -- but the fact that the Government does have open meetings, when those meetings are being held so that you can attend them -- that kind of thing -- and, also, the results of research and development.

That's just a couple of examples, but we feel that the distinctions among the types of information really should be made. We, also, like many others ask that there be further clarification and linkages between the access and dissemination question.

We emphasize the need to include the content that is in the analysis of key sections as an essential part of the policies, an integral part of the Circular. We were concerned that the Circular might be sent out without that, and we feel that that's a very, very important part.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Our strongest recommendation and I quote, "Our greatest concern lies with the omission of any statement of the Government's responsibility" -- a key word to us -- "for all stages in the life cycle of information." We devote an entire page to that. We feel it is very, very important.

Then, talking again about the types of information and getting a few examples -- we think that the distinction between access and dissemination is an important one. We point out that it's a critical distinction, and we quote from the Circular, "Access to information refers to the function of providing to members of the public, upon their request," -- we emphasize that, and what we say is that if citizens don't know information exists, they are not going to request access to it.

Those of us in the library and information community know all too well that people cannot request information of which they are unaware. Providing access is not enough. An act of dissemination role is needed to insure that the information reaches those who need it.

Again, that does not mean that we are going to provide every piece of paper ever recorded in the Government. There's no place you could possibly hold it. It is very, very important to disseminate this information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We also discussed the value of information. I assume that some of our friends at OMB wish they had never put that word solely in Section 7C. We point out the seeming contradiction between 7B and 7C and emphasize that there are many, many values of Government information going beyond that related directly to the agency's mission.

Again, as you can see, many of our comments seem to have been incorporated into the revision.

We say that it's very difficult to measure, but it goes far beyond being a function of the degree to which it contributes to achieving agency's missions. Government information assists in making informed decisions, aids in improving productivity and efficiency of knowledge workers and permeates all aspects of Government work. Recent studies indicate that having the right information at the right time can save billions of dollars.

We feel that other mechanisms to measure the less tangible worth of information are needed to determine the value of information for the citizens. It's extremely difficult and yet very important to anticipate future needs of the information.

That's another concern we have. We may think we know

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

what information is needed today. We then find, ten years from now, that it's essential that we have information about the side effects of the drug or some other kind of information that might not have been gathered or managed because of concerns of cutting costs.

What we offer here is that to determine what the value of information is to the Government -- and we do not mean just those of us who are Government employees. By the Government, of course, we mean the people of the United States. We think that it's a very fundamental policy issue that deserves much more extensive discussion and debate and analysis; and we offer to assist OMB in defining this further.

We think this is something the library and information community can be very helpful with. We know some research that has been done by King Research and by many other groups. We feel that in this way we might well be able to help OMB in measuring some of the less tangible values of information.

We then talk about the entire life cycle of information. I think it's Woody Horton who really has made us think in terms of life cycle of information, a very valuable way of looking at it.

Beginning with the collection and creation and in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

talking about the important need to gather information that only the Government can gather -- and here I am talking about the official agencies -- we are concerned in the Circular that the restrictions on the collection and creation of information may be excessive and could result in a lack of information needed not just by individuals but by corporations.

Our industry itself has made it very clear that there is much information that they need. We quote from a Business Week article and a quote by a man named Roache who says that: "Only the Government can require full disclosure. Industry associations don't have the tools or the analytic understanding to amass data that might be used for public policy purposes -- only the Government, it seems, can do so."

And he says: "Without new information, we'll find ourselves caught in the forest, looking at the same trees year in and year out." We certainly feel very strongly that we want to support our U. S. industry. We're concerned about the decline in the balance of trade -- the imbalance of trade right now -- and we feel that we need to support our own industry in making sure that the information they need to compete effectively is available for them.

We also say that we think some of those restrictions

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

could be penny wise and pound foolish. We certainly applaud the emphasis on economizing, but we caution that the decision to create or acquire information should be based first on what information is needed and will be needed in terms of its value to society.

Overall, we think that while cost effectiveness is important, cost benefit analysis -- taking into account the true benefit to society of Government information -- is even more important. We're in danger of losing sight of the need for information by society and the value to it in our zeal to cut costs.

It is important -- it is critical that we cut cost within our Government. We need to make sure that we do not end up throwing the baby out with the bath water in doing so. There are many other areas than cutting back on the gathering and dissemination of information where we can economize.

Then, looking at the organization and management of Government information, we feel that many agencies are devoting a lot of time and expense to cataloging, indexing and managing their information resources. We feel that more cooperation among agencies to share cataloging and indexing of documents and other publications could result in considerable savings.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We know that many of the Federal libraries are looking at this right now. We certainly know that there have been efforts by the Government Printing Office over the years with the Library of Congress -- sometimes with NTIS. There are many that are underway. We feel that more can be done.

The question of disposition and preservation was not really raised by anyone which, at least, on the comments we saw which rather surprised us. We feel that a very important question here is that we are losing some important Government information.

What Warren J. Haas of the Council on Library Resources has called, "our intellectual audit trail". I'm sure some of you know that the Joint Committee on Archives and Science and Technology, among several associations, was formed a few years ago when it was discovered that an entire warehouse of documents from the Manhattan Project because nobody felt we needed those old documents.

What we're doing now is erasing the tape. It is easy to erase an early form of a document -- because you need the space on the computer, you want to have that floppy for something else -- and so we don't have that important record. Obviously, again, we don't need to keep everything -- we

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

couldn't possible -- but what is important is to have some policies about the disposition.

We refer, specifically, to the report of the Committee on the Records of Government which we think is an excellent report that outlines these problems and that includes specific recommendations.

We commend to OMB -- I know they have it; I know they have read it. We think it is important to stress the need for more agencies to know about this and for all of us who are the senior agency officials to be aware of the important policies that must be established for the entire disposition of records -- deciding what to keep and how to keep them, making sure that they are properly archived.

Dissemination -- our comments were strongest in that area, as were many of other peoples. We referred to the Commission's study of public sector-private sector interaction and the dissemination of information. I know many of you have read it. If you have not read it, I really commend it to your attention.

I'm just amazed at the many quotes I see from that report taken totally out of context -- one principle or one recommendation. We refer to four of these principles and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

recommendations in our comments, all of which stress the importance of relying upon existing mechanisms, primarily the depository libraries of this country.

Principle Number Seven, just to quote one: "The Federal Government should actively use existing mechanisms, such as the libraries of the country, as primary channels for making Governmentally distributable information available to the public." It goes on about the importance of depositing Governmentally distributable information in the depository libraries, using the nation's libraries as means for distribution, etc.

We urge this addition to the Circular of specific reference to these recommendations related to the depository libraries. We also urge that an inclusion of Federal libraries be made in the Circular. We feel that the libraries of the country are an invaluable information resource for agencies and for the citizens of this country.

We also are very pleased and note in here the efforts to cooperate between OMB and the Joint Committee on Printing. The December GAO study strongly recommended this, and we are pleased to see that, finally, we are getting to that.

The word "immediately" in Mr. Ginsberg's statement -- I

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

was very pleased to see. They are immediately going to contact JCP and work with them and with the Government Printing Office. That is indeed encouraging.

The cost recovery question -- we feel very strongly that the decision concerning which circumstances warrant cost recovery should first be made based on the value of the products and services to society. The government may wish to provide certain products and services without charge based on their contributions to the public good. We, again, urge that these be distributed through the Depository Library system.

This is an extremely complex issue. One question that we have never seen discussed really publicly is: Which publication should be made available without charge to the citizens of this country? I mean beyond the Depository Library system.

For example, the Federal Register is a key publication. Should that be available in every Post Office in this country and every library? Should it be sent to every citizen, along with a telephone book? I'm using it sort of as an extreme example, but we're talking about much broader dissemination than what currently exists.

We need to find out the responsibility -- what

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

publications should be disseminated? Then, of course, there are many, many different mechanisms. Should anything be charged for? How does one decide what should be charged for? Obviously, some things are being charged for.

These questions really warrant much further examination, and we offer to assist. Again, it's going right out of the frying pan into the fire, but that is a very critical issued that must be addressed very clearly -- again, starting with the responsibility and the value of the product to society.

In the area of education and training, we agree that training programs for Federal personnel on information resources management are essential because we do know that many personnel have difficulty in managing information resources effectively. This is a fairly new area, and not many people have been trained to do.

Many people of the senior agency officials who are responsible for information resources management in their agency do not have information resources management background. So, we do think the training programs are essential.

We were somewhat surprised at the recommendations that the Office of Personnel Management is the appropriate group to do this. We feel that there are many appropriate groups

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

already existing in the private sector, the library and information community.

The American Library Association, the American Management Association, Special Libraries Association, IIA, on and on -- already have extensive experience in education and training of information professionals, and we think they should be called upon to do this.

There is a lot of concern about the Government unnecessarily duplicating what exists already. We feel that many of these things already do exist.

We are particularly pleased -- this is just a highlight of some of our comments, but I hope the flavor comes across. We stress almost on everyone of the seven pages the need to identify what the Government's responsibility is right up front. I do have, as I said, have a few copies, there.

We are really pleased that OMB and GPO are working together on defining some of this responsibility and who should be doing it and, also, the mechanisms. We did not really discuss mechanisms, other than in the area of education and training and the importance of relying upon the depository and Federal and other libraries.

We feel there is a very, very important role for the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

private sector, here, in taking Government publications, adding value to them and disseminating them widely. Our annual report and some of the reports that we do from the Commission, because of our limited budget, we're able only to print maybe 2,000 copies. Our study on community information and referral services in public libraries, for example -- I would love to have a commercial publisher pick that up and market it really well and distribute it, and it will sell 200,000 copies.

That's the kind of thing that is tremendously important. We will, of course, wait to reserve any final comments for the new draft, but we do want to emphasize a few points that, unless I missed them, I didn't quite hear, yet, this afternoon.

One is this responsibility of the Government -- it is more than just a positive requirement. It is a responsibility to get information the citizens need to them. I think we must be very careful to set that right up on front.

We must first desire what is the responsibility and, then, work out the mechanisms to disseminate this most effectively. That, of course, would involve both the depository libraries, the entire library community and the private sector. We really want to encourage the private sector to add value, to increase the dissemination and to market the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

publications.

I think someone in the comments referred to the Depository Library system as a safety net. There are many important publications -- I don't know all because I don't know all Government publications -- but there are many Government publications that simply must be available in the Depository Library system. I would almost say all, but I just don't know all Government publications.

That is to make sure that any citizen who cannot afford to pay for a copy has access to that information. The Commission is very clearly established right from the beginning -- its goal which is to provide equal opportunity of access to information for all citizens.

I agree very much with David Peyton's comments about the important policies that already exist -- the First Amendment to the Constitution. Thank you for the plug on "The National Information Policy Report" done under the Rockefeller Commission published by the Commission in 1976. What we would like to see in the revised Circular is reference to some of these other policies.

The only references I heard were either to earlier OMB Circulars -- and I know that's part of the intent -- or to the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paperwork Reduction Act, Public Law 96-511. Information policy did not begin in December, 1980. There are many other earlier policies, such as the First and Fourth Amendments to the Constitution, and I think those need to be carefully considered in drafting anything as important as this new OMB Circular.

I have two final comments. One is a quote from Mr. Paul Zirkowski who is the President of the Information Industry Association. I think I should paraphrase. I've heard him say this many times. He, as he says, is a farm boy from the Midwest, and he frequently sat on a three-legged stool to milk a cow.

He said the information resources in this country rest on a three-legged stool. The for-profit sector, the not-for-profit sector and the public sector. If you weaken any one of those legs, you weaken the entire base for the information products and services in this country.

The chief concern of the Commission is that the citizens of the country get the information they need. We repeat our offer to OMB to assist them in providing a forum, in holding hearings, in providing technical assistance in anyway we can. We also repeat to the Joint Committee on Printing our willingness to assist in providing a forum for discussion of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the important issues related to the dissemination, the whole life cycle of information by our Government.

I will welcome your questions and comments. Thank you, again, for the opportunity to be here today.

(Applause.)

MS. CROSS: Thank you all very much. I appreciate your time and the effort that's gone into providing these remarks. Council, what is your pleasure? Would you like to begin having a question-comment section, or would you like to break for a few minutes and, then, we'll begin?

Go ahead, begin?

MR. WILKINS: Go ahead.

MS. CROSS: All right. Would some of the other Council members like to come up, or do you want to speak from where you are? The only thing is that you don't have a microphone.

Let's begin. Council, would anyone like to begin? Any comment or question? Okay, Bob.

MR. WALTER: I have one comment. In light of the comments from almost all the speakers this morning, especially Katie from OMB, I would definitely like to see, given the substantial number of changes you made in your first draft, to encourage OMB, once again, to issue a revised draft in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Federal Register for comments.

If you hadn't made many changes, I could see where you might want to go right ahead. But, as you stated and some of the other people stated, there are considerable changes since the first draft. I would definitely -- speaking for myself -- like to see a revised draft Circular printed in the Federal Register with, at least, a minimum amount of time for further comments.

MS. CROSS: We need to get a microphone to you. If that one doesn't reach, you can come up here.

MS. LEWIN: So noted. I mean that's not a staff decision. As I mentioned in my remarks, we have a new administrator and a new director, and those two people, among others, have to be consulted, as well as the Circular making its tortuous way through the OMB clearance process which is very extensive.

Both myself and especially Tim are aware that the consensus is that more comment would be appreciated.

MS. CROSS: Do try to speak a little more in the microphone because what happens is that the people in the back of the room aren't able to hear. It can come out. There you go. All right, Kathleen.

MS. EISENBEIS: I'm following my notes from two

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

speakers, but I'll try to figure this out. I'm interested in -- I think it was David Peyton's remark about, as I was writing, the "notice of intent". You asked that that be included. Can you refresh my memory -- you were saying that IIA did want to see in the Federal Register that notice of intent and that was in reference to the Paperwork Reduction Act requirement to the agency's --

MR. PEYTON: If I understand your question, we are in favor of the procedural additions to the Circular which will give effect to the policies, so that when an agency intends either to discontinue a publication or to begin a new information program, there would be an opportunity for interested parties to comment. You're right.

MS. EISENBEIS. My thinking was, when I took my notes from Katie, was she described FOIA which requires a publication that we see, the Privacy Act which requires publication, the Sunshine Act which requires notice in the Federal Register and, then, the Paperwork Reduction Act which only requires notice to OMB -- but I don't think we see that.

MS. LEWIN: You should. The Paperwork Reduction Act and the procedures that implemented that Act required agencies to publish in the Federal Register the text of their

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

regulations and note that those regulations are -- the publication of the regulations occurs after OMB has reviewed them.

For the Paperwork's, they have to at least publish the title and a synopsis of what the information collection is and that it is at OMB for review. They also publish two agency contacts, one for the agency that's proposing the information collection and one for the desk officer in Information and Regulatory Affairs, either of whom can receive comments.

MS. EISENBEIS: Do you think that satisfies the request from IIA? I'm trying to make a parallel.

MS. LEWIN: Yes, if we understand each other, I think it does.

MR. PEYTON: For the most part, for some of the major new programs -- perhaps, I should be hesitant because I haven't read the Administrative Procedure Act in a while. For example, the recent Department of Transportation notice about it's intention to set up a new electronic filing system for airline passenger and cargo tariffs.

Maybe Katie could say better. I don't know whether they were legally obliged to put that out as a preliminary notice or not. I don't know that they were obliged to do anything at this stage.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MS. LEWIN: I'm not sure about the legal ramifications of that. Sir, I agree with you it was a good idea for them to include that in the Federal Register, but if an agency designs a system of records, they're required to describe that system of records in the Federal Register. If they make any substantive changes to that system of records, they're also required to describe that in the Federal Register and submit both of those actions to OMB for approval or, at least, for review.

MR. PEYTON: Perhaps, it's a matter of visibility more than anything else. As anyone who reads the Federal Register everyday know. You have numerous agencies with Paperwork Reduction Act notices everyday.

MS. LEWIN: Right.

MR. PEYTON: You could spend a lot of time just hunting them all down.

MS. CROSS: Further comments? Kathleen, did you have some more before I --

MS. EISENBEIS: No, I'll wait.

MS. CROSS: You'll wait? All right. Are there individuals in the audience who would like to ask the panel or make a comment? Come over here and use this microphone,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

please, and identify yourself.

MS. SMITH: Barbara Smith, Skidmore College. It seems to me as I listen today that the basic problem that many of us feel about this whole issue of Federal information policy is that the establishment of information policy is really being done by the wrong agency.

There was a law long before the Paperwork Reduction Act and that is the act that I believe was the establishing act for NCLIS -- was it not, Toni?

MS. BEARMAN: You're talking about Public Law 91-345, to establish a Commission in 1970. The Commission was established to advise the President and the Congress on policy and planning in the library and information field.

MS. SMITH: But, it was literally setting up a very wide requirement for a national information policy -- the executive order from Lyndon Johnson and then the law --

MS. BEARMAN: Excuse me. There's no such phrase in the legislation that says we are to establish a national information policy to advise the President and Congress on policy and planning in the library and information field. That's the wording.

MS. SMITH: Okay, then, I think I will still maintain

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that the establishment of information policy is being done by the wrong agency. We are listening to OMB talk about the costing and the money that's involved in information policy, and I heard Toni Bearman eloquently say today what information policy in this country is all about -- the responsibility to see that the public gets the information it needs to exist.

The best description of information I think I have heard is a phrase used by Karen Smith who is a depository librarian at the University of Buffalo in her response to OMB. She said that information is as an amorphous a commodity as clean air. It's perfectly obvious that we all have to have clean air. It should be just as obvious that we all have to have information.

We're perfectly willing to pay our taxes for a defense establishment because we know that, individually, not one of us can defend this country. We should be just as willing -- and I think we are -- and we should expect our taxes should go to support an information policy that will, indeed, furnish the information which is the lifeblood of our country.

I think until we have somebody addressing information policy for the public good, we don't have information policy. We need information management, but let's get first things first and that's the responsibility of Government to see that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

information is provided for the public good, not just for private profit.

MS. CROSS: Would you like to respond?

MS. LEWIN: I'm sure whatever I say is not going to convince you that this is the wrong agency to do information policy, but I can, at least, quote or, at least, direct you to the Paperwork Reduction Act which does give the Director of OMB the authority and actually requires him or her to develop information management policy and information policy, for that matter.

I don't think that the Circular is -- the intent is not to restrict or limit the information dissemination of agencies. However, I think that agencies have to look at information as a resource and have to apply a practical utility test to those information collections that they engage in.

That's part of the Paperwork Reduction Act; that's work that's done in OMB everyday. Every information collection that goes out to more than ten people must be looked at and signed off by OMB, and the practical utility test is the foremost test that most desk officers apply to those collections.

In terms of cost benefit analysis -- as I tried to indicate in my remarks, the statement in the policy Circular

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

has been amended to take into consideration that it's not always possible to calculate the monetary value of information, but that there are other values that can be ascribed to information that could be considered in a cost-benefit analysis.

I think in this Circular and the revised Circular cost benefit analysis is used rather loosely.

MS. BEARMAN: I'd like to add to that. The whole question of how information policy is set is a very, very important one. It's one that I've been studying for almost twenty-four years, now.

I just got back from a conference in England where I was asked, in one-half hour, to describe national information policy issues in the United States. This was following someone from the UK and before Dr. Appliard of the EEC and before somebody from France.

I had just spent one week at the University of Washington teaching a class on that from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. each day. There's no way to even describe the number of agencies involved in the establishment of information policy in this country in that one week, much less thirty minutes.

This is real problem and it's also a real benefit in

BEST COPY AVAIL

this country. Trying to explain why we don't have a single national information policy, which is why I was trying to be precise about that, the countries that I know who do have a national information policy are almost exclusively Eastern Bloc countries, and they certainly have an information policy. It's not one I would want to have in this country.

(Laughter.)

I say that facetiously but also very seriously. We have a series of policies in this country. The First and Fourth Amendments, I think, are two of the most important information policies we will ever have. There are many, many others. It is very difficult.

The first month I was with the Government I tried to identify the key individuals sitting and working with information policy. It took me a year, and I finally found about ten of them. That was only scratching the surface. I thought we'd get together and have breakfast. Within about six weeks, half of them had gone. They had left and gone to other agencies or left and gone to the private sector.

It is not only complicated, but it is also very, very flexible. For example, the Department of State has just established a Bureau on International Telecommunication and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Information Policy. The State Department, the Office of Management and Budget, the Department of Commerce, certainly Congress, again, a very, very important group.

There is a publication that is coming out soon that Robert Chartrand and Sandra Molevski from the Congressional Research Service have put together which summarizes in -- I forget -- fifteen pages, something like that, anyway -- the major information policy categories, the bills pending in Congress and the legislation passed by the five past Congresses. This is just sections of laws and bills relating to information policy.

That's a very important question. Who should be setting information policy? Do we need to have so many groups? Do we want one single agency? The reason I say that it's a benefit to have so many groups is that the system of checks and balances we have, I think, really does work. It's interesting to be at a meeting in Europe and watch how it happens in our country as opposed to in others.

We have a lot of disagreement. I think there are not many countries where you would have somebody from the Legislative branch and the Congressional branch sitting down with the private sector and somebody from one of the smallest

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

agencies in the country charged to work with all of those people, discussing in open controversy some areas where we disagree.

So, the setting of policies is an ongoing process, a critical one, and I think what is encouraging is to see the number of comments that have come in. That's far more than almost any other Circular, I think is fair to say. This is the democratic or, at least, representative process at its best. We're not going to have anything firmly carved in concrete. We know that. We're going to keep working to fix it and make it better.

MS. CROSS: Very well said. Any other comments? Would you please step up?

MS. HEANUE: Yes. I'm Ann Heanue from the American Library Association, and, certainly, Katie, we're particularly pleased to hear about the OMB's depository library initiative; but, I wonder -- in an overall policy that does rely on maximum feasible reliance on the private sector, how do you anticipate that those documents that are turned over to the private sector will find their way into the Depository Library system? Do you think that that would be part of the guidelines they worked out?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MS. LEWIN: Could you give me an example of what you mean? What sort of documents -- do you mean documents that are produced under contract?

MS. HEANUE: No. Let's say, for example, the Merit Systems Protection Board. There was a notice there, not too long ago, in the Federal Register that because there were some private sector organizations that were producing copies of the law or the laws of the Merit Systems Protection Board, so, the Merit Systems Protection Board was no longer going to publish those themselves. Of course, they were available thrcugh GPO and in the Depository Library system. As I recall the cost of the documents of buying the year's compilation was something in the range of $55.

That was no longer to be available through the Merit Systems Protection Board, and those who wanted to receive those decisions were referred to five or six different private sector publishers. We looked into those -- just what were the cost of those private sector publishers, and they ranged anywhere between $250 and $500 for those same publications. That would be an example.

Those would no longer be available to the public from the Depository Library system. Anyone who wanted to buy them,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

presumably even Federal libraries that are now depositories would be faced with a very significant increase in costs.

MS. LEWIN: I think that there are two things happening that address this issue. I can't speak totally on policy and make sure I'm giving you the bottom line, but our work within the information policy circular and the revised draft, there is a very strong statement that requires agencies to develop procedures to get documents to the Federal Depository Library system. That's a very strong statement in the revised Circular.

There's also work going on by GPO and the Joint Committee on Printing to identify those documents that agencies should be depositing. That's one answer.

This is such a specialized situation that I don't even know anything about it. To be truthful with you, I don't know how this would work out at the policy level with something like this. I know that the policy Circular does make a strong statement that it is not applicable to those sorts of information that are produced under contract to Government.

In other words, those sorts of information that can be copyrighted, even though it's produced under a Government contract or grant are not subject to this circular. But, this

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sort of gray area -- I'll have to get back to you.

MS. HEANUE: I don't think it's so gray or so specialized. In a policy that says, "maximum feasible reliance on the private sector" and given the budget cuts that many agencies are facing, I think you're going to see more and more agencies without much choice, perhaps, in publishing many of their documents. If they want to get them out, are going to have to look for a private sector publisher.

Toni mentioned that specifically. I think we may well see fewer and fewer Government documents even going into the Depository Library system, given this policy. I think it's going to be a very important factor.

MS. LEWIN: I don't think that OMB agrees with you because I think that they feel that this Circular is going to be supportive of the Depository Library system and mandate agencies to develop procedures for this sort of thing, and I guess time will tell. Certainly, OMB does not agree with you on this.

MS.HEANUE: In the whole area, too, of electronic documents, and I think Tom Kleis brought that out that if depository libraries don't have access to electronic documents, that the depository libraries themselves may become less and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

less significant as more and more important information goes into only an electronic format. I think that's a real concern.

MS. LEWIN: In terms of electronic format, that's a real emerging issue and has lots of implications, even above and beyond the policy circular that we're talking about today -- in terms of what makes a record, how do you access that record, how do you make that record available -- that sort of thing.

We have not said that electronic methods or electronic formats are excluded from this. We are talking about information in all of its forms. I think that the specialized format of electronic information requires some thought and procedures to be developed. We have not said electronic material is not going to be available to depository libraries.

I think there has to be some cooperation between the agency and the depository libraries that once that information is received it can be used, among other things.

MS. HEANUE: Let me ask you, too, though. Going back to my earlier question on reliance on the private sector -- once a document has gone out to the private sector because for one reason or another it's been determined that that's a more suitable place for dissemination, if the private sector publisher decides to discontinue publication, what provisions

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

are there for bringing it back either to the Government or having someone else in the private sector pick it up?

Then, again, we're talking, again, about continuity, and it may or may not be part of the Depository Library system. We're looking at potentially great gaps in the nation's memory.

I do have a specific example of just that sort of thing happening very recently because I did talk to a private sector publisher who had taken over publication of something called the Federal Statistical Directory that hadn't been produced through GPO since '79. He decided to do it about a year ago.

He just did not sell as many copies as he had anticipated doing and has decided he's not going to do it in the future. Who will? I think there are going to be more and more and more examples of Government publications that we're just going to see disappearing.

There are very, very few of us who have the resources of the time or energy to keep tabs on what may be very important pieces of our documentary heritage that are simply not going to be there anymore.

MS. LEWIN: You see this all as a result of the information policy circular?

MS. HEANUE: No, no -- not specifically that because

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

this happened before -- I mean, the discontinuation of that, but I think it certainly is a trend that we're going to see accelerated through the information policy circular if it's published as read.

MS. LEWIN: There has been a change in the information policy circular that addresses the idea of starting up new collections of information and discontinuing.

MS. HEANUE: Right. David mentioned publishing that in the Federal Register. Is that a part of the Circular? Is it specific in there just how that procedure will be set up?

MS. LEWIN: It says that when an agency decides to discontinue an information dissemination or the publication of an information collection, if it is significant -- and, again, agencies will have to develop procedures about what they think is significant -- there should be an announcement in the Federal Register in time for comments, so that if those publications are truly valuable, there will be comments heard that, indeed, those things are valuable and they shouldn't be discontinued.

There are no procedures in the Circular as stated right now that would require an agency to continue an information collection from one private sector to another.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MS. BEARMAN: I wanted to follow up on that -- perhaps, with a question to David Peyton because this is a concern of ours. For example, from our little agency -- here I am, the director of the agency, trying to implement the policies set out. We feel that everything we publish is very important and needs to get out. It all goes into the Depository Library system.

We really want to see it also disseminated more widely in other mechanisms, as I said, to add value and have it distributed to the private sector. What about the publications that are available only from the private sector?

My question is: In thinking of the public libraries in this country -- and I'm sure most of you know that people who work in public libraries on an average are working in libraries that have a total budget of well under $50,000. They may have three people on the staff -- hopefully, one is a professional librarian. They're serving well under 25,000 people -- 25,000 citizens.

With that size budget, if something goes from $100 to $150, they may not be able to get that any longer. If something is available only for $200, they may well not be able to get it. Do you see any responsibility for the Government to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

issue publications, even if the private sector issues them at a higher price that may be out of the range of many of the libraries and the citizens?

MR. PEYTON: I think this tends to get back to the development of guidelines with OMB working with the Joint Committee with substantive criteria that would tell you where the crucial programatic interest is in getting some publications out to the private sector. Obviously, the Government puts out an enormous range of stuff. Some of it is vital to the workings of democracy, and some of it isn't.

Without some substantive criteria to tell us what the Government puts out that really is needful for citizens to have at their disposal, so as to be effective citizens participating in democracy and informed consumers making good choices on their own behalf, of participating in the consumer economy.

I don't know how to address things in general.

MS. BEARMAN: I think, David, though, that's a dissemination point. That certainly is important for OMB and JCP to work together to see how the agencies' publications that they've already decided to publish should be disseminated to the Depository Library system.

My question goes before that. You know there are many

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

directors of agencies who are under the gun to cut costs, and there's not an incentive to publish more things. If there's a way to do anything more cheaply, you're supposed to try to do it.

I understand that concern. I'm a manager, and I feel very strongly that we must be as cost effective and as good managers as we can be; but who's telling agency heads the importance of the information that they need to get out and is there a responsibility, do you see, for the Government to decide to issue things in the first place, even before we get down to the dissemination or to gather the information? How do I know what I should issue or gather?

I'm not the head of the agency; our chairman is, but as the director of it. That's not JCP and OMB -- OMB clearly has said it's up to the agency head. Where does that incentive o from to do this?

MR. PEYTON: It sounds to me like a matter of what your organic statute says and what the agency's mission is and what the language is in both the statute and any legislative history that would give you an idea of what the intent of Congress was in directing the agency to carry out its activities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MS. BEARMAN: Even if it competes with a private sector publication or service? And, I'm not asking this to be difficult. This is the kind of difficult question that we are confronted with all the time. One directive says, "Thou shalt not do it if it exists in the private sector." The agency's mission says, "Thou jolly well shall do this."

How do people make those decisions, and who is going to help them decide? How do you see those decisions taking place? I know it's not just the OMB Circular. It's a lot more than that -- clearly.

MR. PEYTON: Could you give me an example of what you mean?

MS. BEARMAN: Take any one of the new pieces of legislation that says: "Disseminate information widely about child abuse." "Set up a national network to disseminate information." Now, I think child abuse is probably not a good example -- that's a clear public interest area.

But, something that might relate to economics, for example, which could already exist in the private sector and when in many cases the mission is in conflict with the desire not to compete unfairly with the private sector. How do you balance those?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MR. PEYTON: In a circumstance like that, I think the search would be on for some kind of targeted subsidies, so that instead of changing a price to all consumers or users, most of whom don't need or deserve subsidy, then, you would try to figure out who the meritorious or poor people are who you're trying to reach.

To use a well-know example -- the National Library of Medicine, certainly, MEDLINE has information on it related to health care. Health care is supposed to be a vital interest of all of us, and we have the Public Health Service and any number of other agencies that are trying to improve the level of our health.

However, the content of what's offered on MEDLINE is essentially indistinguishable from the content of several private sector services -- the content being bibliographic citations to published medical literature that is privately published medical literature.

If there is some public interest in getting it to certain deserving groups, whether it's med students or a poor religious hospital that doesn't have much money in its budget, then, I think the search is on to identify ways to provide subsidies to those people who need them and not to people who

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

don't need them, like staff scientists at Squibb or Pfizer or some large pharmaceutical company.

MS. LEWIN: If I can comment further on what you asked -- being a desk officer and looking at agency information and collection requests everyday, there's no problem with agencies collecting information and their desire to do so. That's overwhelming and we have an enormous amount of requests for information collection everyday from agencies.

The policies that exist now have not been changed by the information policy circular. It's Circular number A76 which has been promulgated for years does set out the idea of reliance on the private sector when that is necessary and proper.

The agency also must fulfill their mission. I think that's a checks-and-balance system -- that not only are they being directed to rely on the private sector, they are also being directed to fulfill their function and their mission. It's up to the agency head with advice, I assume, from their staff to come up with what is their mission, what are the functions that the agency should be doing itself and what sort of things can they farm out to the private sector.

MS. BEARMAN: That's contracting out which is a little different from saying, "only available from the private

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sector". I think that's the concern many people are expressing. It makes a lot of sense. We do a lot of contracting with the private sector to get things done, to get artwork done for covers, all kinds of things that can be better done by them.

The question is: "If it's only available from them" -- and that's what I keep hammering away at. What is our responsibility, and we want help in defining that. We're not trying to attack or choose sides. It's a question of how does one determine what is the Government's responsibility and who determines? Big questions.

MS. CROSS: Barbara.

MS. HULYK: Barbara Hulyk, Detroit Public Library. I guess that's what I'm asking -- same question -- perhaps, in a different way. I've seen other publications that have gone. I think it's the U. S. Claims Court Reports that are no longer in the depository system. I was at a similar conference to this one at the end of September, and they were mentioning that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board Journal has gone the way of all good things.

The only statistical information from that agency now available is through their press releases, and most people

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

don't know that and it doesn't come through the depository system, as I understand it at this point. A replacement to that journal is being published privately by the board itself, without the statistical information.

I guess what concerns me -- I think the reason that OMB is getting all the flak for what obviously is a meritorious endeavor to establish a national policy of sorts is that it comes at a time when the Executive Branch represents the cutting back of Government publishing. This is a government agency that is setting the standards.

I think that when you talk about checks and balances, we're not sure we're seeing checks-and-balances. I'd sort of like to Mr. Kleis' view of what checks there are on OMB if the Circular -- now, as revised, it sounds much better than it did originally -- if it goes through without public review, again, where does Congress fit in?

MR. KLEIS: Of course, I'm not speaking for all of Congress and would in no way attempt to do that, but I would think that the members of the Joint Committee on Printing have always been very strong in their interest in public access.

Senator Mathias has spoken on that over and over and

BEST COPY

over again. He clearly believes that the Government has an obligation to get information out to the public at the lowest possible cost and to make sure that all the needs of that information, all the statutory requirements are met.

In the instances where the Joint Committee on Printing has given waivers to agencies to take a publication into the private sector, we've always clearly stated that there will be depository library distribution made by whoever the outside contractor is, that no royalties will come to the Government and -- I'm trying to remember the other provisions; there are two other provisions. The main one is that depository library copies are given by the contractor.

I'm not sure I'm addressing your question exactly, but our concern has always been the depository libraries get the information and that the Superintendent of Documents be the vehicle for sale of Government information, as well. We have seen instances where the publications have gone into the private sector and have decreased in cost to the public.

I believe there are instances you could show where the opposite has happened. From our point of view, though, I think as long as the depository library distribution is met and as the public has the widest access to that information, be it

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

through the private sector or through dissemination in the Government Printing Office, that would have to be our primary goal.

Only when we saw an abuse of that or where in some respect the agency was getting around getting its information out to the public through some means that we didn't approve of, then, we would take the issue to the members of the Joint Committee and make the agency well aware of our concerns.

I'm not sure whether I've answered your questions, though.

MS. HULYK: Not really.

MR. KLEIS: Maybe I didn't quite hear it well.

MS. HULYK: Let's use an example. If OMB had not responded to all of our comments and recognized the needs that we see for information dissemination and access to the public and so forth, what would the Congressional check would have been -- what could it have been?

MR. KLEIS: I think the Joint Committee would probably have joined the other committees of Congress who have held hearings on this in expressing their very strong views about this Circular. I think we would just have been another voice in this.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Actually, we didn't really have to do much because there were some other committees involved that made their objections very clearly known to OMB. If, indeed, nothing had been done, if the other committees had not done that, I can assure that the Joint Committee would have taken a very strong position on this and brought the issue to the attention of other committees. In this case, we didn't have to; they really did all on their own.

MS. LEWIN: Let me ask you a question. This is obviously a problem. I don't think that this -- maybe it's being brought to a head by the policy Circular, but I don't think that its roots are in the policy Circular -- or do you feel that way?

MS. HULYK: I think the policy Circular has brought the issue to a head, but the fact that it's the Office of Management and Budget that is directing all of this -- I think it's probably the one agency that we all react to as being the restrictive agency. Perhaps, that's a wrong statement, but I think that's the way most of us react.

We are more concerned when OMB says, "Thou shalt not do it this way, and thou shalt print privately at low cost and so forth" -- because we see that OMB is more effective and more

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

powerful in making changes throughout the Executive Branch.

MS. LEWIN: When OMB says "at the lowest cost possible" and "employing cost-benefit analysis", I think that one of reasons for that is to try to introduce that concept into information management. Either Toni or David mentioned the life cycle of the system or of an information system, and oftentimes agencies will request to collect information without truly the faintest idea what they're going to do with it -- if they're going to keep it, if they're going to publish it, what use it's going to be put to.

I think that sort of concept should be emphasized even more than cost-benefit analysis. The fact that there has to be a life cycle, there has to be planning and consideration and that these requests, these collections of information, this dissemination has to have some root in a program or a mission or a mandate to an agency to do something, to do a certain program.

MS. HULYK: Can I ask one other question? At the point at which the revised OMB Circular goes through whatever procedures it will go through and if the guidelines that I've heard mentioned today several times, both by GPO personnel, as well as you people, what about the publications that have

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

disappeared? Will there be a process or will there be a way for us to get them back into the depository system?

MR. KLEIS: What publications -- what do you mean?

MR. HULYK: Let's take the Merit Protection Board, the U. S. Claims Court, that sort of thing where judges in the case, I believe, in the Claims Court are handing the mimeographed copies of their decisions directly from their offices to the private sector; the private sector gives the judge the printed material; he gives the Clerk of the Court printed material and that's it. That's what the Clerk of the court says.

MR. KLEIS: The waivers the Joint Committee on Printing has given to some agencies have almost always resulted from their saying they did not have funds available in their budgets to publish the material. We examine that very critically because the amount of money involved in creating that data in the first place -- or the people who worked on it -- is so much more enormous than the reproduction costs or the distribution costs of it.

We find that often a very difficult thing to swallow that people couldn't afford $40,000 to publish it, but they spend $10,000,000 to create it in the first place. But, there

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

are instances where we do examine that, and there are instances where clearly they cannot afford it. They are that tight on the budget.

We have probed into it in terms of their appropriations and know what their expenditures are. If they cannot publish it in any other way, they just simply would not publish it at all. In most cases, that's it. We'd respond to FOIA requests or something like that. It is better that it gets out at least through the private sector than not get out at all. I think we have to say that.

Your concern was about depository library distributions. Again, we are aware of the situation. We always request the agency to make sure that if it goes to an outside contractor and if it is a legitimate publication, that the copies get to the depository library as required.

It seems to me that I heard recently about the SEC -- for example, all the forms that people file with the SEC. The question is: Is that something that should go to depository libraries? Does the agency have a need to consider that a publication or publish it in some way and make sure the depository libraries get it -- all the forms that are filled out by American corporations.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I don't know the answer to that. I would have to say just because the Government collects information for its purposes of regulation or whatever that it may not have a requirement in this case to make all that information that they have collected available to depository libraries, except in some abstracted form, perhaps, if they choose to do it that way.

MS. HULYK: I don't think the issue, though, is that kind of information. I think the information is, for instance, the reports of a Court or of the Merit Systems Protection Board. Where it totally goes into the private sector, certainly, the activities of a U. S. Court or Board is in the public interest for them to know the decisions.

I guess, maybe, Mr. Peyton probably could respond to that because I think there ought to be some need to provide the information, even if it's nothing but letting the regionals and the depositories have it.

MR. PEYTON: I'm not quite sure how to respond to that. I assume the agency must answer all FOIA requests for such materials. I don't know whether we have cases of agencies that are not abiding by their Printing Act obligations to submit their publications to GPO for distribution in the Depository

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Library system.

My understanding is that there have been times when the agency compliance with those regulations has been very poor. If that's the case, then, appropriate steps ought to be taken, so that agencies do comply with their obligations under law, so that things don't slip through the cracks somehow.

If we're talking about a case where the agency doesn't have any legal obligation to publish outright, then, maybe, there ought to be an amendment which Congress would have to enact, so that the agency did have a requirement to publish and the appropriated funds were provided for that activity.

MS. BEARMAN: It is true that there are agencies that do not follow that. We have found that from time to time, and that's a real difficulty. What I'm wondering in listening to the kinds of questions raised about specific cases is would it, perhaps, be helpful to have a small forum from JCP and OMB looking at some very specific instances of publications that no longer exist or are no longer available from the Government to the depository libraries, so that these could be used as examples in developing whatever guidelines to help agency people responsible so we do know.

For our agency, it's quite clear. We publish it. It

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

goes through GPO, period. Then, we hope other places, too, but it's that "in addition" question. Would it be helpful because in determining some of these guidelines, it sounds as though let's look at a few concrete examples and see: Are they no longer available? Should there be a requirement that they go to all the regional depositories and the selectives?

If any for-profit company or private sector not-for-profit is going to publish them, they must be required to put them into the Depository Library system.

MR. KLEIS: I think Bernadine from our staff may want to add something.

MS. HODUSKI: Bernadine Hoduski, Joint Committee on Printing. I just wanted to clarify about the Merit Systems Protection Board and the Tax Court. I haven't visited the Court of Claims, yet. They are publishing, they are issuing their slip decisions, their slip reports and so on. What they're not doing is issuing them in a bound version. The depository libraries had previously received those publications in a bound final version.

We have an agreement from the Tax Court to publish on microfiche, now, through GPO. The Merit Systems Protection Board -- I just sent them a memo with information on doing the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

same thing. They sound very likely to do that. I don't know about the Claims Court since I haven't talked to them.

This is a situation where they internally are also selling the information. The private sector is not coming in and just picking it up. They're buying copies, they're running a somewhat internal subscription service. It's obviously something designed for the public. They're selling it to the public, and the private publishers come in and pick it up and republish it.

In a case like that, there's no difficulty knowing whether it's public publication or not. We're simply meeting with these people and explaining the situation to them. In a lot of cases, they simply did not even know when they either printed it through GPO or had a mailing list where they sent a copy to the Superintendent. The Superintendent in the past had simply been distributing it.

They weren't even aware they were participating in a depository program or that it even exists. When you go and talk to them and explain this, they are eager to continue to be part of it. It's just a matter of enough staff on our part and GPO's to go out and talk to everybody.

I think that's where the Circular will help us -- that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

it will notify these people that there are mechanisms and people to talk to about it. If they're faced with a cutback in their publishing money, there are other options. They're cheaper ways to publish.

I'm not in the total despair I think everyone else is. It's just that I can't go to lunch with enough people to get them to change their minds fast enough. Maybe you all should take turns going to lunch with some of them.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University of Notre Dame. Two questions: First of all, is it an assumption by OMB that just because it is contracted to a private sector contractor, that, indeed, the information is disseminated and is reaching the intended audience? And, two, where in the proposed circular is the assurance that, indeed, it was contracted out, now we're going to look and see that the audience for which it was intended was reached, other than just economics. Sure, we're going to save money, but we didn't reach half the people that we used to reach for a similar amount of funding or something like that..

MS. LEWIN: Are you talking about when they contract out the collection of the information and the processing of the information or just the publication?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MR. HAYES: Collection of the information doesn't have an audience there to begin with in terms of measurement. So, let's put it as output.

MS. LEWIN: I would think that if they were contracting with a private sector agency to do this part of the contract would be to reach the audience for which the publication was intended. That's just good procurement practices.

It should be detailed in the contract in terms of whether or not the Circular includes anything that would require agencies to survey and see if, indeed, the contractor's fulfilling his part of the contract. There's nothing in the circular that requires them to do that, but, once again, that's part of contracting.

MR. HAYES: The reason I asked is, indeed, we've lost a lot of publications, but I've yet to receive a notice from Energy saying, "Now that we have contracted to Commerce Clearinghouse, are you, indeed, receiving the same information and are your users as happy with the CCH product as they were with the Department of Energy material?

It may be good practice, but unless it says something in the proposal to jog a memory, I don't think it's going to get done.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MS. LEWIN: No, it doesn't say anything specific like that. It does say, "You will insure that these documents get to the federal library system." But, it doesn't say, "by doing surveys of your contractor, etc."

MS. EISENBEIS: On a little different note, isn't that information resources management person supposed to be doing some of that and how is that working that out? I was glad to hear Toni mention the remark from NCLIS about training that particular person. I hadn't heard that particular argument. It sounded good, and can you say something about the change in personnel that you have. Don't you have somebody new on board to do that? An information resources management personnel?

MS. BEARMAN: What I was talking about was in the circular it recommends that the Office of Personnel Management take on the responsibility for the education and training of information resources management people. Are you talking about the new director of the OIRA itself? Mrs. Gramm.

MS. EISENBEIS: Right. I think it all links together. I think part of the thing that we're talking about, that Steve was talking about, was supposed to be taken care of in the agencies by that kind of a person who was trained and informed. We don't see that the agencies are -- they don't have the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

concern or the sense of spirit that the documents librarians have in terms of getting the information to the people.

MS. LEWIN: That may be true. I have no statistics to back that up, but I think you have a trade off there. The appointment of the senior official, which is the person you're referring to in the agency, who's supposed to be the IRM policy official, the IRM manager, should be somebody who reports directly to the head of the agency.

I would say 99% of the time, that's not going to be a librarian. That's going to be somebody like the Executive Director for Information or the DAS for Administration, somebody like that who -- therefore, you get in a top policy level when you have to promulgate things like this, when you have to come up with information policy.

You can get into a policy level in the agencies, but, then, you pay the price that you mentioned that they don't have the same librarian concerns that you might like. I think that's a trade off. Those single officials are supposed to have staff who work directly with the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs; however, I must admit that although I don't have the specific agencies that were referred to today, I don't know if those discontinuances of certain publications were ever

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

discussed with OMB.

In terms of the new staff at OMB, we have James Miller who is the Director, who was the Commissioner at Federal Trade Commission and before that was the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, which would say that he is familiar with our function and will be, I assume, interested in us. Then, we have Wendy Gramm, whose husband is Senator Phil Gramm, who is the new Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs.

MR. KLEIS: Might I add something to that? It's been our experience that the senior official or the IRM manager is not directly responsible in many agencies to the head of the agency, often has nothing more than a staff function but no other staff at all and really doesn't seem to fulfill the requirement of either the Paperwork Reduction Act or what the Joint Committee on Printing supported in its notion of their being a senior IRM official who would also receive printing and publications, not only telecommunications, office automation and AUP -- because the Paperwork Reduction Act never specifically addresses printing and publication.

It talks about information and it talks about AUP and telecommunications. The Joint Committee on Printing believed

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

printing and publishing, of course, are a very important part of information in the Government. I get the feeling from discussions with various people at OMB that printing and publishing is not something that they consider directly related to information resource management.

They're talking the kinds of things that the Paperwork Act specifically refers to and, therefore, would be highly unlikely that the information resources official in the agency would even be aware of the agency's publishing program in the first place until they get it together because the publishing program in most agencies comes out of the public affairs of the House.

The IRM really would probably be ignorant of the agency's publishing program.

MS. BEARMAN: I think that's a very key point that I would like to emphasize. At that famous lunch, we do a lot of eating lunch, obviously in Washington, that we had that December of 1980. This is news totally to you, Katie, so, I don't mean to be putting you on the spot.

In the request from Ken Allen, Jim Tozi and John McNichols -- "Help! What do we do? There's this new law side." We offered to do several things and, one, we suggested that the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

senior agency officials really need a lot of orientation and training.

I know that there have been some general meetings of the group. I was one of the two information professionals who is the senior agency official until Sarah Kadec retired from the Government. Now, I'm the only one -- to my knowledge -- with real information library background, and that's not their fault. These are Assistant Secretaries responsible for administration or whatever.

They're not going to be trained to be information professionals. Let's be realistic about that. What we offered to do was to help put together with some additional funding -- very honestly we don't have it in our budget -- a series of seminars or even one, three-hour orientation session for the senior agency officials, bringing in experts from the private sector, from the library information community.

What is IRM? How do you manage it? What is the life cycle of information? Things like that. Then, to help work with existing group, like the library information profession, to do some of the training required for the people who are going to do this on a day-to-day basis because, of course, in most agencies, the people who are actually doing the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

information management are either in data processing, in the library, in other areas of information management.

There are lots of good courses available. The Department of Agriculture has them. As I said, the associations have them. We're willing to help with the senior agency officials. OMB is not the expert in the library information field. They don't pretend to be.

I think that the people at OIRA have been extremely fast learners and continue to do a super job in keeping up in our field. I thank you're the only librarian there, right now, aren't you, Katie? So, they need the help of the information community in educating and training the people who are working in the Government, to deal with the changes that we get all the time.

We repeat that offer, and I'm sure I can count upon the librarian information community to help us in the education and training process.

MS. CROSS: I think that I'm going to bring the discussion to a close at this point. I think our panel members have been very patient and have answered a lot of very hard questions. This is a difficult issue. It's not going to be decided in a day, obviously. We certainly appreciate your

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

coming and sharing with us your expertise, your knowledge in your respective areas.

We will have a break and reconvene in about probably twenty minutes or so. I hope that you can stay just for a little while. If some people need to talk to you, they'll have an opportunity. Thank you, again.

(A short recess was taken.)

MS. CROSS: Jay Young kindly agreed to come back and tell us more about pricing on the Monthly Catalog. Yesterday we discussed the possibility of the cost increasing greatly if certain things were done. Jay has some alternative suggestions and pricing recommendations that he would like to present.

MR. YOUNG: I don't really have a pricing recommendation, but what I do have is that we've looked at the catalog from the standpoint of some of the things that have been proposed.

I think that one of the key things from the standpoint of sales of the Monthly Catalog is that we have to have a decision now, in order to be able to handle the renewals and the things that have to take place, assuming that we want to start whatever is going to be started by the January, '86 issue. We have sixty days to do that in, so we're coming down

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

close from the standpoint of Sales.

Since this forum has been opened up to suggestions, we thought we'd put in our two bits, as well, and actually say what we think, in terms of what would be the best sales product. Actually, the discussion has been on four products, as I understand it -- the Register in paper, the Register in fiche, Index in paper, Index in fiche.

The first thing is that we don't even consider what the size of the indexes might be. The size of the index is part of the problem. As you know, the size of the index may be up to 1100 or so pages as was discussed yesterday. Even assuming if it stayed the same size as it is now and we broke it apart, we would be talking about two separate subscriptions of two separate books, each this big. This is the Register; this is the Index.

When we do that, we're going to increase the price substantially because now we're talking about printing from scratch two different books. Each book, then, will have its own initial handling, set up, printing, charges in it. Whereas right now, we have one book that only has one charge.

This is going to make a major difference in the pricing of the thing. Actually, each one of these done separately

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

wouldn't be much less than what this one is right now. We'd be talking twice this. Even if the indexes stayed the same size, that's what we'd be talking about in price -- almost twice what the thing costs now for the paper.

What's the solution? What we'd like to suggest is that we leave the paper product essentially as it is -- leave the Indexes and the Register as one document, leave the Indexes like they are. There would be two products, the thing like it is now, in paper and as it is now, in fiche.

The third product, then, would be the Register and an expanded, cumulative Index, except for possibly not including the keyword index in fiche -- the Register and an expanded, cumulative Index, monthly in fiche. In our opinion, the best product that we would have to sell would be that expanded, cumulative Index in fiche.

In terms of one-step look-up for the expanded Indexes, there's two data elements that we think need to be added. The first off is the subtitle for the publication, which is not in the proposed expanded data elements for the Indexes right now. What this seems to us to mean is that you have Flood Insurance Studies and you don't have a subtitle saying what state it is --it doesn't tell you anything. You need to have

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the subtitle.

The other additional data element is the price. It's not in there. The stock number is, but the price is not. I think that's an advantage -- I don't want to say this absolutely -- but it would seem to me we're talking about two different products, and the depository libraries could get both products -- free, I mean, as a part of the program.

The other thing that we would propose is relating to the Congressional Serial Set. The Serial Set, as we understand it, is very difficult to determine when the thing is actually going to be produced. If we can't absolutely be assured that it will come out in a specific calendar year, so that we can include it in that subscription service, which may be a problem, we would recommend that it be sold as a separate publication.

In other words, the Serial Set is a separate thing on its own. I would propose selling it not as a part of the subscription service but as a separate, individual publication. It can be in either microfiche or paper or both that we'd sell it.

Back to the only other thing, Jennie, that I would mention that needs to be considered and, actually, the product

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that we're proposing -- the Register and the expanded, cumulative Indexes -- would be to consider whether or not you would want the keyword index in there because the keyword index, cumulated, is going to be huge.

That, itself, is going to throw the whole thing into whether it's useful or not is questionable. We could either leave it out or in the fiche product, it could still be there, and it really wouldn't make that much difference in terms of fiche and the cost. That would be up to --

MS. CROSS: Jay, yesterday Sally raised the concern that when you have a different product in your fiche or print -- when they're not the same, you run into problems. Am I stating that correctly? If you took it out of one, we'd probably take it out of the other. Do you want to comment, Sally? Maybe, I'm not --

MS. McLEAN: No, I'd rather comment a little later.

MR. YOUNG: What this would mean as far as the Monthly Catalog -- there will be two products, and one product would the same as it is now. The other, in order to do the cumulation for fiche, there would have to be some programming done very quickly. My thought would be that it could be done. There would probably be some increased administrative burden on

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sally and her people because they're going to have to be dealing with two products, of which one is different.

She means that there's a little bit more clerical things that are going to have to be done -- actually, review and edit, if you will, two products. From our standpoint, after hearing the discussion here about what's happening in the private, commercial market, then, if we're going to compete, which we would like to, then, it seems to us that the expanded, cumulative Indexes is the way to go -- and the Serial Set, then, as a separate publication. Question?

MS. CROSS: Yes, did you have time to come up with any information that you could share with us on just who are the subscribers to the Monthly Catalog?

MR. YOUNG: No, I didn't. Lou Reed was going to do that. We can try to have it in the morning for you.

MS. CROSS: It would mean a lot.

MR. YOUNG: They started, but it was just impossible. It was going to take too much time.

MS. CROSS: Okay, Jim, you had a question.

MR. VEATCH: Jay, we were looking, yesterday, at those figures about what had happened to Monthly Catalog sales during the past five years. They have gone down drastically.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

If the first option were to be adopted, if we were to say this is what we want, would it be, as far as you can tell, a saleable item?

MR. CROSS: I think -- yes -- what I've suggested.

MR. VEATCH: No, what we had suggested.

MR. YOUNG: The 1100-page.

MR. VEATCH: Yes, right.

MR. YOUNG: No, it's going to be so big and priced so high that we can't see that it would be a product that anybody would buy. The bigger, the more pages, the higher the cost -- and that's our opinion. If that were to come into us to be a sales product from another agency, we would probably have great doubts at whether we'd select like that.

MS. TULIS: I don't agree with that because we purchased one copy, and we would actually purchase it -- maybe the Register in microfiche and the Indexes in hardcopy. I don't think you can say that just because of the size, people are not going to purchase it. We would probably keep our depository copy in total paper. We're lucky we have the space right now.

MR. YOUNG: I think the combination of the Register essentially like it is, plus the fiche Indexes would be a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

better mix and a better product.

MS. JACOB: I just want to be sure that these Indexes would accumulate monthly?

MR. YOUNG: Right.

MS. JACOB: Up through the year?

MR. YOUNG: Yes. That would allow you, for instance -- one thing you could do is you get the next one, and now you can take that one and give it to somebody else, the first one.

MS. CROSS: Bob.

MR. WALTER: Jay, one comment that comes to my mind on the price being added, which is certainly minor to the total issue, here, but the fact that your cost, your prices over the years have changed so often that I never encourage anyone to rely on the price that's in there anyway.

I always suggest they check PRF, and, personally, I just kind of like your reaction -- I don't see any useful purpose of the price as an element in that Index.

MR. YOUNG: We're working very hard to settle prices down, Bob. John, why don't you mention -- go to a mike, John. This is John Beadle, Chief of our Sales Management Division.

MR. BEADLE: I think it's important that on pricing the price has not changed for the last three years on any item that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

is being sold by us. We have not changed prices. We have stabilized prices. The only thing we do is change the formula once a year, based on the new budget, and that is applied against new publications coming into the inventory.

We do reprice all subscriptions on an annual basis, but that's just to get the new postage and the new cost of living in there.

MS. CROSS: Kathleen.

MS. EISENBEIS: I think you're looking at it as a pricing catalog, and we look at it as an access tool. I'll go back to NTIS and their price codes that change, and we're used to the fact that you have a price code with a price figure that will change. I think you're going to be misleading people if you don't look long range in terms of that being a print product, and people look at the price in print.

I think you're going to be stuck with people --

MR. YOUNG: The price will be in the printed product. Right? It is now.

MS. EISENBEIS: Look five years, ten years, twenty years down the road when people are using that Monthly Catalog.

MR. YOUNG: Are you suggesting take the price out, now?

MS. EISENBEIS: Yes. I don't think it needs to serve

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that purpose, basically, bottom line. We have the PRF for price; we use it for price. I don't think we look at the Monthly Catalog as a pricing catalog.

MR. YOUNG: I wouldn't have a problem with that I don't guess, right off.

MR. VEATCH: I do.

MR. YOUNG: I think Bernadine would.

MS. HODUSKI: Title 44 says price and place available. That's what the law says. A Monthly Catalog is supposed to be a sales catalog. Whether GPO uses it as a sales catalog, it's open to discussion. Not only is it supposed to list the price from GPO and the price from NTIS -- but from other people. The price and place available -- it doesn't say the price from GPO or available from GPO. They used to list that kind of information --

MR. YOUNG: That could still be in the Register. I would not suggest that you drop it out of the Register, but it certainly wouldn't have to be added as an element into the Index.

MS. CROSS: Jay, was talking about the one-step look-up os where he was suggesting it being added. Jim.

MR. VEATCH: Right. I do use the Monthly Catalog as

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

pricing because I buy my documents, which is true of a lot of people who buy Monthly Catalog, I would assume. There are a lot of people who buy Monthly Catalog because that's the only way they get it. They're not depository libraries.

If you don't have the price in there, then, you're saying you people are going to have to buy PRF, too, whether you want to or not. That's the only way you'll get pricing information. Besides that, there's the fact that if you're talking about one-step look-up, then, it's very nice for me if I'm going to do one step, then, that's one of the things that I would want there.

If I'm going to be using that Index, yes, I'm interested in price. If I'm using that Index, I'm also looking, primarily, for things to buy from the Sales Program, and that's the one indication in that Index that that is a sales item. Isn't that right?

MR. YOUNG: Yes, the stock number would be there, but, then, you'd have to go back to the Register to get the price.

MR. VEATCH: Right. So, I think we should keep the price both in the Register and in the one-step Index.

MR. YOUNG: That's our proposal, and after quite a bit of thought yesterday and this morning, that's what we

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

suggest.

Bob, I want to tell you that I already made the change that you suggested about the bullet this morning, and it will be that way. That made it a whole lot simpler to explain. I didn't have to mention International Exchange, then, just use the bullet. I appreciate your bringing that up, and it'll be printed that way tomorrow.

MS. CROSS: Thank you, Jay, for coming back; and thank you, John.

This morning we didn't have time to have some information about the Education Task Force. As I had mentioned, Pat Reeling couldn't be here and that GPO would make some remarks. At this time, is it both of you?

MR. FOSSEDAL: I want to thank everyone who's been here for the last couple days, particularly the new members of Council who got introduced to this thorny issue on Wednesday. A lot of decisions may seem difficult to make, but, really, even though there for a lot of money, they're often easy.

This one's a very difficult decision for me. There are so many ramifications and variables that I admit that I don't understand that I thought what an outstanding opportunity to give everyone an opportunity to see the complexity of the issue

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and give me their thoughts on it. I really appreciate all of the input which you have given to me and to Council.

When the transcript is done of this meeting, I'm going to be able to go back over it, and, perhaps, we can come out with a decision that will be best for everyone. I don't know if that's possible. But, again, I thank you all for your input.

Normally, I'm pretty decisive because most decisions are not that tough, but, again, this one is one that's pretty complex. Again, thank you.

MR. SCULLY: Let me first mention that Jay's handout on the ondemand project, that is the revised version, is being reproduced right now and will be available for everyone on the table, as well as the Council members, of course, early tomorrow morning. You don't have it now, but it's coming.

I've been asked to tell you something about an issue that many of us have been thinking about and talking about ever since the spring Council meeting in Atlanta in 1984 when Chuck McClure made his very dynamic presentation about a task force on library education and the need to develop library workers' competencies in their field.

There was a lot of enthusiasm generated at that point.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It kind of took on a life of its own. I'm going to tell you, chronologically, now, and in a very general way, where we've come since this issue came to the fore.

This past March, in fact, early in March, '85, Don Fossedal and I took the train up to Rutgers in New Jersey and spent a day with Pat Reeling. discussing objectives, approaches, very general concepts regarding the proposed task force on library education and depository training.

Essentially, out of that day and its discussions and interactions, came the decision to assemble a task force to develop short-, medium- and long-term projects for improving basic competencies of depository library workers.

What we were thinking of and talking about, then, was for a group of experts -- librarians, library educators, people in the know and people who have some insight into the deficiencies and the needs of this area -- to come together and, through their deliberations, develop some project proposals that the GPO, the Federal Government, could take and set out in terms of steps to be accomplished and dollar signs to be assigned to them, cost estimates, and then arrange these in such a way and time them in such a way that they could be implemented and carried through.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

That's where it was left at that meeting. Now, we go ahead in less than a month to Albuquerque, where Pat and I spent two hours discussing, essentially, how to get there. What would be the next step to take after our discussion up at Rutgers. We agreed that we would kind of carve up the duties.

Pat would develop what we call a charter for the task force, defining its scope, its organization, the timeframe, outputs -- just what would be expected of this group of people. Once that was developed -- to send this out as an invitation, I would draft the invitation for the Public Printer's signature to cover this charter and send it to the people who would be invited to participate on this task force.

At summer of this year, it became apparent that there would be some limitations to the funding and staff resources, here at GPO. So, we reconsidered the scope and scale of this particular project and felt we might have to draw back a bit, thinking that we rather not start something that we couldn't deliver on or fulfill.

In consideration of these limited resources and in terms of funding and staff, we notified Pat that the national scale task force notion probably could not be supported from GPO for resource reasons. Rather, more of a Washington-based group

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

would have to suffice because of these limited funds and staff time.

Also, in considering the fact that the people who would bear the lion's share of the work on this here at LPS, I've thrown full force into accomplishing more inspections; that is, Joe McClane and his team. We're expecting to accomplish instead of 150 inspections -- more like 300.

My point is that we backed off from the national scale, and we're looking now at something more of a Washington based. We might fly in a couple of experts from other areas of the country, but it's not going to be a great group of nine or twelve people as had originally been envisioned.

Where do we go from here? That's where we stand pretty much at the moment. Before the end of the year, by January at the latest, Don and I will, again, go the the banks of Raritan, as we say, in New Brunswick to meet again with Pat and plan on something in terms of hard-action steps based upon this limited, less ambitious kind of an approach we're going to take.

I say less ambitious in terms of the method, but Don and I believe -- and I think Pat concurs in this -- that we can probably accomplish just as much and just as well with fewer

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

people operating here in Washington and flying in one or two out-of-town experts.

That's where we are now and that's what we intend to do by roughly the end of the year or the end of winter -- to go again to see Pat and frame out something by way of an implementation plan with action steps and go forward with something like that.

I can say now that we'll do that and we'll update you all at the next Council meeting in the spring. I'm sure we'll have something more firm at that time. Meanwhile, this doesn't represent everything that we're doing now or plan to do in the area of outreach and education and informing depository librarians about the program.

Just Tuesday of this week just past, in this very room, we hosted -- how many librarians; about ninety -- I believe, about ninety librarians -- Dave, is that a good figure -- with the first workshop we've held in quite some time. I know a number of you did attend that this past Tuesday. That was a small effort.

I've heard it was successful. We're pleased with that. By the way, that was videotaped, as well; so, we'll use some of that footage in putting together a videotape for other

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

informational purposes.

We're looking forward to hosting the American Association of Law Libraries here in Washington next July. They've asked for some kind of a presentation -- a workshop for their members. Again, we'll be giving that.

I was approached by a representative of the Administrative Offices of the U. S. Courts who requested the same kind of a presentation or workshop for their people who are coming into Washington.

We're doing these things on a targeted basis. Of course, the thing that I spoke of earlier that we're planning out with Pat Reeling is more of a generalized basis to touch everyone in the system or nearly everyone in the system in some way -- again, the objective being to raise the base of competencies of library workers.

We say library workers and not librarians because our Council members and our depository librarians tell us that much of the work, as you know, is done in the backroom -- in check-in, in claims, in a lot of the backroom work -- and these are the people who need to know a little more about what's expected of them and about how to function in their jobs.

All I can say is that I'll have more at the spring

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Council by way of where we're headed and exactly what we'll be doing on this score with the task force on library education.

MS. CROSS: Jim, you have a question?

MR. VEATCH: I have a question for Mark. Did you all do an evaluation of this workshop? Was there an evaluation sheet of any sort distributed?

MR. SCULLY: No, we didn't do an evaluation. We did get comments. In fact, I have two or three sheets on my desk right now of people who have turned in comments about the speakers and how it could have been done better and saying some speakers did very well and that sort of thing.

But, no, that's something we probably should have done, and we will do in the future. We have done that in the past, I believe, in past workshops, but we didn't do it this time.

MS. CROSS: Perhaps, Mark, when you look at the videotape, you can do some critiquing and, of course, also have an opportunity to do some editing and know what you can eliminate or what you need to add and so forth. I think that's great that you did have it taped. It will give you a future reference. It's easier to have something tangible.

Any other comments from our Council?

We're going to end on time, folks. As I mentioned

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

yesterday, the Council is adjourning at 4:30 today so that we can meet to work on the recommendations that will be presented tomorrow. We're meeting in the Hayden Room. I don't know how much room is in there. I don't think it's a huge room. If somebody feels so compelled, he can come in, but we would ask you not to participate. We are going to try to have the recommendations available for Council, as well as the attendees here, in the morning. We had arranged for secretarial help to stay tonight, but because we are not sure how long it will take us, we hated to ask somebody to stay beyond their regular working hours -- three, four, maybe five hours. Since there are people who do come in early in the morning who will be here to prepare the recommendations in a nicely typed format, they will be available and be distributed in the morning. Everyone will have an opportunity to see a copy before we discuss them.

Unless there are other matters that need to be attended to now, we'll -- Peggy.

MS. PRUDDEN: Peggy Prudden, Montgomery County Public Library. I'm a 30% depository. Can I see hands of anybody else who's 30% or less?

(A show of hands.)

MS. PRUDDEN: That's great! So many could come. Thank

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

you.

MR. FOSSEDAL: I'll be standing by in my office till about 7:00 o'clock if anyone has any burning issue which they would like to discuss or anything. I'll be across the street; so, just come on over and come up to the Fourth Floor. I'll be sitting there catching up on the other 80% of my job. I'll be glad to talk to you. I invite you to come over. I'll put on the coffee pot. I even have hot chocolate, a soda machine downstairs.

(Laughter.)

I'd really enjoy -- if any of you really have an issue that you'd like to discuss, I'm certainly available.

A PARTICIPANT: How are we going to get in the building?

MR. FOSSEDAL: I'll tell the guards, and my extension is 3345. So, if any of you come over, and the guard talks to you, just say you want to come up to the Fourth Floor. There are signs leading you to my office, and I'll be sitting there and glad to discuss anything you want to talk about --libraries or the Green Bay Packer victory over the Bears Monday night.

(Laughter.)

MS. CROSS: Also, please wear your badge.

MR. FOSSEDAL: That's a good point Bernadine and Jennie.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

With the badge, you might be able to buzz right by the guards.

MS. CROSS: I thought you might bring your coffee and hot chocolate over here.

(Laughter.)

MR. FOSSEDAL: I'm very, very serious about letting Council do their thing without having me there --

(Laughter.)

MR. FOSSEDAL: -- and I will see their recommendations in the morning.

MS. CROSS: As a caterer, only.

MS. FOSSEDAL: Oh.

(Laughter.)

MS. CROSS: Thank you all for your kind attention. We'll see you in the morning.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE